

O R,

The Sentence given by *George Fox* himself
against himself and Party in the persons of
his Adversaries, ratified and aggravated
by *W. Penn* (their ablest Advocate)
even in his Hushing Book of the ~~Pro~~
~~uation of G. F. &c.~~

BEING

A Defence of that little Book Intituled
The Spirit of the Quakers ~~True~~

HERE

It is manifested out of their Writings, that ~~the~~ ~~Quakers~~ do but equivocally confess the ~~Divi-~~
~~ning~~ *Quakers* do but equivocally confess the ~~Divi-~~
~~nity~~, and plainly deny the *Humanity* of our Lord
Jesus Christ, the Mediator between God and Men.

Also, from eye and ear-witnesses, is related the ~~Di-~~
~~vine Honour~~ some give to others of them.

By *Henry Newirth*.

And no marvel; for Satan himself is transformed
into an Angel of Light. 2 Cor. 11. 13, 14.
Who is a Liar but he that denieth that Jesus is the
Christ? He is Antichrist that denieth the Father and
the Son. 1 Joh. 2. 22.

London, Printed for *Francis Smith*, at the Elephant
and Castle near the Royal Exchange in Cornhill;
and at the same sign first Shop without Temple-
Bar, 1673.

LIBERI VIVOTORI

12. And when I saw it, I fell as one dead.
20. And when I heard him speak unto me,
I fell as one dead. 21. And he said unto me,
Get thee up and stand upon thy feet: I
will command the winds and the waters.

CHAPTER

12. And he said unto me, I am the Root and the Branch of David, I am he that smiteth and he that healeth.

13. And I said unto him, How long shall it be before these wonders be fulfilled?
14. And he said unto me, I will shew thee the mystery of the things which shall be. 15. And he said unto me, I will shew thee the mystery of the things which shall be.

16. And he said unto me, Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice, let him open the door: and I will come in to him, and we will eat together a meal.

17. And he said unto me, I will shew thee the mystery of the things which shall be. 18. And he said unto me, I will shew thee the mystery of the things which shall be. 19. And he said unto me, I will shew thee the mystery of the things which shall be.

20. And he said unto me, I will shew thee the mystery of the things which shall be. 21. And he said unto me, I will shew thee the mystery of the things which shall be.



Controversie Ended :

O R,

The Sentence given by George Fox himself, against himself and Party in the persons of his Adversaries, ratified and aggravated by W. Penn, (their ablest Advocate) even in his Hufing Book of the Vindication of G. F. &c.



T cannot seem strange to any judicious Man that considers the nature of the Argument I undertook against the Spirit of the *Quakers* in *G. F.* that I should doubt of Mr. *Penn's* being able to satisfie his Conscience in its Vindication, becaus. I look'd upon him as a Man of some Learning and Judgment more than others of that Party, and as conscientious as many.

But behold ! a Book is at length come forth under his Name, and bearing the Title of *A Vindication, &c.* Which having considered, I must confess I.

find my self mistaken in the opinion I had of him, both in reference to his Judgment and Conscience. My reasons for such change of my mind, I shall in these Papers produce. And first, His address to his Reader challengeth some short remarks.

1. He will have me to be *the most unjust of any that ever yet wrote against them, because (faith he) he draws a general charge from a particular failing.* I answer, He should first have answered the Reasons I gave why I did so. But do they not generally account *G. F.* most eminently filled with that Spirit wherein they boast? Did he not write this Book in the Name of the *Quakers?* Have they not defended it? And doth not *W. P.* here in their Names undertake the defence of it? And in such a case I am justified by *W. P.* himself, see pag. 136.

2. He faults my generosity, because I wrote against *G. F.* at a juncture (faith he) when he might understand him to be at America.

Ans^w. Methinks it favours of arrogancy, as if the Voyages of their great Prophet must be as generally taken notice of, as if he were some Prince or Cardinal.

3. He suggests the unseasonableness of the opposition, just when they should make the best of an unexpected toleration.

Ans^w. And would they not have cryed out with more colour of reason, if it had been done at a time when they were under sufferings? *And if he tells us (faith *W. P.*) that he had no mind to add to our troubles, he deals deceitfully: for his self-safety, and not charity to us was the hinderance.*

Ans^w. It's no marvel that *Mr. P.* errs in judging men's hearts, when he fails so grossly in things before his

Controverſie Ended.

61

3

His eyes, as I ſhall ſoon ſhew. But the Bookseller can tell him, the little Book was ſo well approved of by Men of Learning and Authority, (persons I know not) that it might have been printed in the moſt dangerous times.

4. But it's a very grievous thing to them to want my Name, and no ſmall enquiry have they made after it ; which ingenuous Persons would have ſcōr'd to have done : But I perfwade my ſelf, I gave ſatisfying Reasons to all unprejudiced Readers why I concealed it ; and *W. P.*'s Book hath justified them: for he hath at a venture given me a new Name, and ascribed to me what may ſeem odious under it. If they ſet their Names to their Books to have praise of men, I ſeek it not.

Next, he is much offended at a quondam Friend of his, who was ſo kind as to give away ſome ſix-penny Books to thofe he knew would not buy them, and yet were concern'd to read them : A notable Crime in another Man, but a Virtue in a *Quaker*? I wish they would practise it in reference to their *Vindication*. But he beſtows ſome foul Epithets upon *G. F. as Kſave, Puppy, &c.* *Answe.* O the blindneſs of Self-loye ! that Mr. P. ſhould thus expoſe a man's name for words ſpoken in a free manner, and privately to his Acquaintance, and that after he had recall'd thofe terms, and promis'd to forbear them for the future ; and in the mean time himſelf to be ſuch a proficient in abusive Terms and Phrases, as if he were Doctor of the Chair among the Satyriſts, ſave that he mixeth ſome *Billingsgate* language withal. I ſhall here present the Reader with ſome of his ſweet language ; if I ſhould tranſcribe it all,

I dare say, it would take up more Paper then I intend to write in the whole.

Measure his Book by the Title, *The Spirit of Truth Vindicated against that of Error and Envy, unseasonably manifested, [as if there were a season for the manifestation of Error and Envy] in a late malicious Libel.* He designs to mischief; owl-light way of stabbing men, or deceiving people; — great injustice and deceit; Mongrel-Socinian; stupid or malicious; more Mahometan than Christian; Serpentine Associates; a lie, plain lie, arrant lie, palpably belie; idle Boaster, indeed a very Dreamer, his vulerous Eye; malicious Comments; his own vexed, base, murdering Spirit; meer novice; — wickedly sayes him; weakness, folly, malice, and untruth; Saturnal Dreams; so over-run with the lazie, &c. left his Wits behind in exchange; Pseudo-Linguist; brawling Associate; to will mischief was present,

etc. This miserable Man; [Why may not be profane Scripture to abuse men? smaller degree of distracti-

on: O stupendious folly! such creeping Spirits; how dark and vile the man is; the poor man has an irksom way of telling his Tale, &c. wonted folly; so absurd---better Argument out of Bedlam, Sacrilege and Ingratitude, I almost tremble to think on; brazon'd, language of brutish malice, such Bats as himself, fools himself, frosty spirit, peevish, Antichristian, &c.

If he say that I have applyed the like opprobrious terms to G. F. as *False Prophet, Lyar, Impostor, Falsity, Forgery:* I must tell him; 1. That the nature of my Argument required those terms; I could not express that which was necessary to be said without

but them, or such like. If *G. F.* be a Prophet, he must be either a true one or a false one. 2. *G. F.* supplyed me with them, bestowing those, or the like, upon his Adversaries upon unjust accounts. But I appeal to any prudent man, whether *W. P.* might not, with greater advantage to his Apology, have omitted his many reproachful and virulent expressions. Besides, I doubt not but to make it as evident as the Sun at noon, that *W. P.* is himself guilty of those very Crimes which he falsely charges upon me, and in those very Instances.

Before I came to the main Argument of my Epistle to the *Quakers*, I addressed my self to them by way of Introduction, wherein I gave some reasons of that manner of Argument which I intended. This *Mr. P.* first falls foul upon, and by the honesty and discretion he useth here, we may judge of his performance in the whole Treatise.

In his first and second Sections, the Reader may take notice how greedily he catches at the commendations I give of some of them: I said there were honest-hearted amongst them; and he faith, *He is pleased to allow us, at least a great many among us, to be honest-hearted*; It may as well be understood of some few. Is he not a modest man? If his Neighbour say, *Honest-hearted*, he will have it, *at least, a great many honest-hearted*. I said, *Whil'st some of you excel in many things, &c.* But *W. P.* (like a man that will rob his Neighbour for praise rather than go without it) faith thus, Sect. 2. *If we excel in all things, as he confesseth*: Here *W. P.* has committed a double falsity. 1. He puts *all* for *many*; and 2. the *Quakers* indefinitely, for *some of them*. I have look't among the Priates *Errata's*,

whether he had not corrected *all* by *many*, but find no such thing: And if I should grant him that error (without good reason) yet the other piece of falsity, viz. putting *me* *the Quakers* in general for *some of them*, will abide by him, to the gross injury of me, and the shame of himself. Doth he call me *idle Boaster*, and at the same time vainly boast of the praise I never gave them?

In his third Sect. He calls those praises, (which by falsifying my words he wrings out) *paying them their due*.

In his fourth Sect. he saith of me, *Nor doth he less then palpably belie us in telling the World, we con- damn all virtuous Persons whatsoever, if not of our own Perswasion.* And yet I cannot understand his Answer to be less than an implicate concession of the Charge. Sure I am *G. F.* denies the Wor-Mystery, ship and whole Religion of all Sects that differ from the *Quakers*. It seems I belie them with a matter of truth, which, because it is not plausible, *W. P.* would palliate. You may see what he's resolv'd on.

He saith, Sect. 5. *Christ's Person* (which he (meaning me) prejudicially sayes *we deny*) is, &c. My words are these, *But you seem at least to deny his Person.* Is there no difference between denying, and seeming to deny? But I shall have occasion to speak further of this matter. Only the Reader may take notice all along of his great honesty in quoting my words. But this is a trivial fault in comparison with that which follows.

“ *W. Penn*, Sect. 8. But (saith he) he promiseth “ for the future to decline this way of proceeding, “ and withal, *to avoid the use of both Scripture and Reason,*

Reason, &c. I will not (faith he) give him the lie, but I hope he will not say I am uncivil, if I tell him, He has already contradicted himself, and broke his word with us; for within eight lines, he that promised to relinquish all personal reflection, layes to our charge, &c. And in p. 92 he has it up again, and gives me the lie in plain English, which he faith here he will not give me. His words it thus: "First, Then he has broke his word with us, which in plainer English is, he has told us a lie, in assuring us, at the beginning, he would deal with us neither from Scripture nor Reason, and yet undertakes both. Now Reader, have patience to hear my words, which run thus: But it is not my design at this time to take a full view of you: And indeed I have found it very fruitless to deal with you by way of Reason and Scripture for your leading men, &c. It follows in my next page, "I will not therefore now deal with you so much by Arguments drawn from Reason and Scripture, and depending purely upon the understanding and mind, but by such Arguments, whose evidence depends mostly upon the outward Senses. Now let the better Reader judge on whom the lie is to be fixed! and whether I have not sufficient reason to tell him, *He is both uncivil and unchristian.* Behold here the infallible Minister! the Censor of the World, and of other mens foul language! Behold, the Spirit of Truth vindicated! Let me beg of thee (Reader) to read his Book: See how he treats me, and what himself deserves! Acknowledge the special hand of our Lord Jesus in giving up this man to these shameful failings in the very entrance of his work.

Pag. 15. Upon occasion of my saying they look upon

10 Controversie Ended.

upon themselves as led by an infallible Spirit, this plain English-man takes up his Post, and will defend this: *That God's Holy and On-erring Spirit, is, or should be, the proper Judge of Truth, Rule of Faith, and Guide of Life among men.* I commend him for his wit: I have charg'd G. F. with about fifty such failures, as for which he condemns his Adversaries to be perverters of Scripture, and consequently, Deluders and Blasphemers. *W. P.* here in vindication of him, enters into a long discourse of two and thirty pages, to prove from Scripture, Reason, and humane Authority, *That G. F. is, or if he is not, should be led by an infallible Spirit;* for his Hypothesis is no other way to his purpose.

1. I do not only willingly grant, but contend for it, *That there was in G. F. at that time when he wrote his Mystery, &c. a Conscience, which had he hearkened to, he should thereby have been a Law to himself, and it would not have suffered him to be guilty of such things as he condemns in others.*

2. I grant also that this Rule is infallible, *viz. That he that judgeth another for any thing, is inexorable, if he do the same thing himself.*

I grant, 3. that God is the Author of this Conscience, Light, or Knowledge.

4. That *G. F.* might have known the Rule afore-said by a good use and improvement of his own understanding; but I suppose he came to the knowledge of it by some outward Teaching or Tradition, especially by the Scriptures.

And so, 5. the Spirit of God may in a true and good sense be said to have taught *G. F.* that Rule, because it inspired those that preached and wrote that Rule in the Scriptures.

6. That

6. That the Spirit of God was ready to have assisted him in walking according to that Rule.

7. That it may be, God did by his Power and Providence work upon him toward obedience.

Lastly, Perhaps the Spirit of God did at that time when he was about to disobey, suggest to him his Duty and Rule: But there is little reason to think so, because that Rule was sufficiently known to G. F. by the means aforesaid; and God is not wont to give that special Gift, but to his humble Servants and Friends, or to those whom he will employ upon some special business in the World. And if he had such a suggestion, the more notoriously wicked was he to disobey so great a Light.

Now if any judicious Reader will take pains to consider the 25 Texts W. P. has quoted, (and he may add 25 more to them) with their Contexts, I am perswaded he will find them every one to intend some of the Cases I have mentioned.

Now let us see if we can understand what W. P. intends by the terms of his Position; for we must understand him, as he understands the Scriptures, not Literally, but *Mystically*.

1. We are to know that by *God's Holy and Unerring-Spirit*, he means (if he means as the leading Quakers) neither Hypostasis nor Person, nor any thing else, but God himself, who is the Father.

2. By *Judge of Truth, Rule of Faith, Guide of Life*, he means, That God doth immediately teach G. F. and every man, to judge infallibly of all Truth, what is to be believed, and what to be practised. [For otherwise it is not intelligible, *That God should be the Judge of Truth, &c. among men.*]

And

And therefore 3. that the Scripture is (as he saith pag. 38.) much like the shadow of the true Rule, which may give us some ground to guess what the Rule it self is. In the next page, he saith in effect, That the Teachings of God, are like the knowledge of the Princes Will and Secrets, *viva Voce*, or immediately; which he that hath (and every man ought to have) needs not so much the same when he meets it in print, that is in the Scriptures: They are like a *Gazette* to a Privy Counsellor. But he saith,

That the eternal Spirit, [that It had been to be desired, that he had not failed in his English in Writings] is, these immediate Teachings to be superior to those ed in his Writings. So that when G. P. saith, *How can they but delude People that are not infallible?* This is to be heeded more than any sentence in Scripture, and is superior to those Writings.

4. He means by his Position, that men are to be guided into Truth, and Faith, and good Life, immediately, in opposition to their endeavours, studying the Scriptures, setting themselves to Prayer, Reasoning, Preaching, and the like; that is, such of these as are performed by us, which he calls, (p.84.) *Running in our own Wills, poring, beating of our Brains, and daily striving.*

Now if this be his meaning, (as manifestly it is) then let any man, that has read any of those Authors Books, tell me whether he thinks that any one of those he mentions was of his mind, that is, *Tollet, or Maldonate, Beza, or Dr. Hammond, or Hutchinson, Socinus, Schlechingius or Crellius?* Did they not all abhor that Doctrine? It comes to this,

That God has made men with faculties capable of believing and understanding what the Will of their earthly Superior is, by the means of Ministers, Messengers, Proclamations, Writings, &c. and of obeying his Will heartily without immediate assistance. But if our Heavenly Superior will have us to know or do his Will, he must tell us immediately himself, he must go along with us, and lead us step by step, or else he must expect no Service, Duty, or Obedience from us at all. The truth is, This Doctrine of the necessity of God's immediate Teaching, doth overthrow the Mediatorship of the Man Christ Jesus our Lord, and quite subvert the Gospel; for *mediate* and *immediate*, are directly contradictory.

Besides, still we have gain'd nothing by this Doctrine; for if men do not hearken to the Un-erring Judge, or mistake him, or resist him against knowledge, refusing to be led by him, they fail as much as if they had no such Immediate Guide, but a Mediate Guide and Direction. Let Mr. Pen be the Example; who even in the beginning of his Book, has (notwithstanding his immediate and infallible Guide) run into five or six such palpable Fallacies and Calumnies, as I am confident the *Cobler of Gloucester* would never have been guilty of; nor any man else, that had not been transported with pride, rashness, and revenge. What has he gain'd then by his immediate Guide, which another man (that knows by Nature or Tradition he ought to speak truth) is not equally capable of?

But why doth this Apologist spend so many Pages upon this Point, and take no notice of my arguing in the following Lines, which he saith, I had ob-
sisted

liged my self against? Must it be past over therefore? I am perswaded (to use his words) he was confounded at it. It was to this effect; " We by " your own confession have the Light within, or the " infallible Guide as well as you, why then is not our " Doctrine as true as yours? You answer, That we " are not obedient, we are in the customs of the " World, &c. and therefore not to be heeded. Thus " you prove your selves to be in the Truth, and us to " be in Error, not by Divine Reason, and Holy Scri- " pture, but by the high opinion you have of your " selves, and your low opinion of others. And if indeed they acknowledge that there are vertuous Persons that are of a contrary perswasion to them, and none but who are guided by an infallible Spirit, then they are no more certain than other men, and we need still an infallible Judge. I add, If every man hath, then I have a measure of infallible Light, the least measure whereof convinces of sin, especially gross sins, such as Malice, Envy, Lying, Murdering-Spirit, &c. which *W. P.* imputes to me: But I am so far from having any such convictions that on the contrary, my Conscience bears me witness of a hearty love to Truth and their Persons, in what I have done, and am a doing: Therefore, if their Doctrine be true, his Imputation is false; if his Imputation be true, their Doctrine is false. But enough of this.

Having now in this Introduction given the Reader a proof of *W. P.*'s faculty in accusing, meek language, faithfulness in representing my words and sense, modesty in praising himself and Party, evading of that which is weighty, confidence in denying what they are charged with, and his sense of the Spirits

Spirits guidance; We are pretty well prepar'd to make a conjecture of what we are to expect from him, in the handling of the main Argument; which I think fit first to give a short account of. And I must tell you, that it is *Argumentum ad Hominem*, an Argument against G. F. formed out of his own words, and runs thus:

He that is not Infallible, is a Deluder;
But G. Fox is not infallible,
Therefore G. F. is a Deluder.

The Major Proposition (as they call it) is expressly proved by that Quotation out of G. F's Book, where he saith, *How can ye be Ministers of the Spirit, if ye be not infallible?* And, *How can they bese delude people, that are not infallible?* And again G. F. saith, *Is it not Blasphemy for you to Speak and Preach that which ye have not received from Heaven?* Whence I further Argue thus:

He that Speaks and Preaches that which he hath not received from Heaven, is a Blasphemer: But G. F. Speaks and Preaches that which he hath not received from Heaven, therefore G. F. is a Blasphemer.

It remains now that I prove the Minor Proposition of the former Argument; namely, *G. Fox is not infallible*: and that also I shall do out of G. F's words, thus: He that so quotes Scripture, as that he expresses the Pronoun *Ye*, where it is to be understood, or renders the Greek Preposition *iv*, *by*, *miss*, or

The instances of these things out of G. F's Book, are to be seen in my Epistle, p. 5, 6.

among,

among, or to's, or puts *He* for *We*; or leaves out something that ought to be expressed, or adds to Scripture words; *He* that doth any one of these things, or that which is manifestly equivalent, such an one is a Perverter or Corruptor of Scripture, and not infallible: But *G. F.* doth some one of these things, or that which is manifestly equivalent; therefore *G. F.* is not infallible. The same medium proves the *Minor* of the second Argument, viz. *G. F. Speaks and Preaches that which he hath not received from Heaven*; Thus, he that perverts or corrupts the Scripture in any of the forementioned Instances, or one that is manifestly equivalent, Speaks and Preaches that which he hath not received from Heaven. But *G. F.* doth so pervert the Scripture, Therefore *G. F.* Speaks and Preaches that which he hath not received from Heaven. The *Minor* of this, and of the former Proofsyllogism, namely, that *G. F.* doth so pervert the Scripture, was proved in my Epistle, by fifty Instances out of *The Mystery. G. F.'s Book*; and I appeal to every of the great unprejudiced Reader, whether there be not as much weight in every one of them, as in some of those, for which *G. F.* chargeth his Adversaries with perverting of Scripture? And whether there be not in many of them greater weight than in any of those? And if it should prove that but two or three of those fifty Instances are full to my purpose, it would be enough to prove what I have undertaken, namely, That *G. F.* is, according to the true sense of his own words, a Deluder and Blasphemer.

I have been forced to this way of syllogyzing, that Mr. P's fallacious way of handling my Argument

gument may more readily appear ; though I believe the common people did understand it as well (if not better) in that vulgar way, wherein I propos'd it in my Epistle.

But to return ; The evidence of all the Premises, is matter of Fact, obvious to the eyes of every man that can but read English, and discern one word or phrase from another, or when he finds more or less in any Sentence ; for what can be lighter than the adding of a Pronoun to a Verb, where it must be understood.

But I must not go too fast ; though my Argument provcs G. F. to be a Deluder of People, and a Blasphemer, and so a Lyar ; yet it doth not prove him to be a false Prophet, or Impostor : therefore I added that large (and indeed blasphemous) Testimony of *Solomon Eccles*, who saith, *Who [G. Fox] is a Prophet indeed, and hath been faithful in the Lords business from the beginning : It was said of Christ, That he was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not : So it may be said of this true Prophet, whom John said he was not.* I added also the Quakers common Principle, which doth not permit any one to be of the Ministry, (as they call it) but Him or Her that hath an immediate Revelation, or a Prophet. Now if G. F. be a Prophet, and a Prophet indeed, not only of the Ministry, but the most eminent therein, and the Patriarch of the Quakers ; and if he be a Deluder and Blasphemer, even when he Speaks & Preaches, then it follows roundly, that G. F. is a false Prophet,

I suppose they will not deny that writing to all the World, in defence of Religion, is Speaking, or Preaching, or equivalent.

or an Impostor. This is the substance of that Argument which Mr. P. undertook to overthrow. Let us now see, how he hath acquitted himself in that warfare.

First, He doth not charge me with one word of false quotation, (that I remember) either out of Scripture, or G. F's Writings, so that I take it for granted, that the quotations are all true and genuine. 2. He grants that G. F. is a Prophet, or *sent of God, by his eternal Spirit, to turn people from Darkness to Light*, p. 67. 3. He doth not deny, at least for the most part, but that what I have ascribed to G. F. as Scripture words quoted by him, is such, and consequently distinguished from G. F's Paraphrases, Explications, or Inferences. But he doth deny, 1. That G. F. his affirming things to be true,

* Here this great Linguist has forgot to write good English, that is his Mother-Tongue.

which are false, and false which are true, * to be obvious to their eyes or senses: That is, He denies that G. F. his putting them for him,

(Col. 3. 10.) thereby changing the Antecedent; *with* for *in*, (Ephes. 2. 6.) the corruption he blames in others; *Conscience* for *Thoughts*, (Rom. 2. 15.) *God* for *Lord*, (Rom. 14. 9.) *God* for *Christ*, (Col. 3. 16.) and so of the rest; He denies, I say, that these and the like falsities in G. F's quotations of Scripture are obvious to his senses: and yet 1. they are words written, and therefore proper objects of sense; and 2. the change of the words, (which is the falsity in this case) is in his answers not denied, but excused. So that this his first Answer comes to this, That W. P. doth deny that to be obvious to his sense, which he reads and acknowledgeth by excusing. And if this answer may serve his turn, I must confess I am

now

non-plust; for when I have shewn an Object of sight to a mans eyes by noon-day light, and when he perceives it, and acknowledgeth it by manifest implication: If he still persist to deny it expressly, I cannot help it; nor I think any man in the World. I may well be said to fetch Arguments *out of Bedlam*, (as he sayes) if I should prosecute such a man any further. — But for the sake of some that will believe their Sense and Reason, I will proceed.

2. He utterly denies that such falsity, as I have spoken of, *renders G. F. either a false Prophet or Impostor*; Lyer he doth not deny. Now, 1. I must confess I have not so subtil a wit as to put a difference between a lying Prophet and a false Prophet; and if my Argument will serve to prove G. F. a lying Prophet, I will not contend, whether the name of *Impostor* be proper for him, but use it without scruple till I be better informed concerning it. 2. Let it be considered, what it is that *W. P.* denies, and it will amount to as much as if he had confess it. For he denies that such falsities or changes of Words and Phrases, (in citing Scripture) as *G. F.* by his infallible Spirit, calls perverting and corrupting of Scripture, are such; which is all one as to say, that *G. F.* is not infallible, and if he be not infallible, he is judg'd by himself to be a Deluder and Blasphemer. Now hath not *W. P.* vindicated *G. F.* to purpose? Or, has he not, under colour of vindicating him, condemn'd him, and that with the most opprobrious terms he could devise.

This that I say is very manifest, so that if I would spend my time, or the Readers, so unprofitably, I might here transcribe almost all that he saith as any way pertinent to the Argument, and all his vilifying

Speeches on that account, and retort them upon G. E. to whom they do in truth belong, and not to me. For though I have in some instances imputed fawfulness to him for small variations from Scripture words, because I saw that those variations countenanced some error; yet I am confident, it would never have entered into my head so to do, unless I had first found him blaming his Adversaries for perverting Scripture upon far slighter, yea, and ridiculous accounts.

Might I not here tell G. F. as *W. P.* tells me? (p. 50.) Had he not been void of all sense himself, and reason too, he would never have suffered so much weakness and untruth, to pass the Press without correction. And (p. 21.) That no man in that compass, could have manifested more weakness, folly, malice, and untruth, (as well in defending of his own, as in opposing our Principles) then G. F. hath done in his *Mystery of the Whore*. Witness the quotations before mentioned, and *W. P.* Again, (p. 52.) with a little variation; But that a man should make 22 corrections of so many Texts of Scripture corrupted by the Translators, and twelve or thirteen of them to depend upon the rendering of the Greek Particle *εν*, in, and not otherwise, befits no man that loves to be profitably employ'd, but it therefore suits G. F. which is so over-run with, &c. That on Ship-board (a kind of publick place, or else I should not mention it) he suffers (as the Passengers inform) elder men than himself, and Prophets too, to minister to him in the lowest Offices, such as untying and pulling off his Shoes, &c. But how should Mr. Pen know that I am so over-run with the lazy? Did his infallible Spirit reveal it to him? for otherwise he doth but gues who I am. Here he scorns

scorns me with *Saturnal Dreams*: See the tender Conscience of this Quaker! He dare not use the word *Saturn*, when it is a meer signification of a certain day in the week, as *John* or *Thomas* is of a man; but when it serves to abuse his Neighbour, he can use it without scruple.

Again, p. 53. *I look upon it* (saith W. P.) *as conceited and presumptuous*, for any man to undertake what he cannot prove, and not less base to affirm a man miscites, perverts, and corrupts Scripture, when he renders the genuine sense of it. Had Mr. P. so soon forgotten what he had read in the Page immediately foregoing? (Epist. p. 6.) Or, Doth he think that *Destroy ye this Temple*, is not the genuine sense of *Destroy this Temple*? is this to vindicate G. F. to render him base? And may not Mr. Pen (p. 62.) confess himself troubled, [as well for G. F. as for me] not at his great skill, but folly? When he finds him asking his Adversaries, so like a Critick, *Where doth the Scripture speak of humane*, the word *Humane*? And will not W. P's words, p. 64. serve pertinently against G. F. viz. *Certainly then this word Humane, is not of such dangerous consequence, nor consonant to Scripture-language, as this idle and ignorant person would render it.* But I must hasten. And yet give me leave a little to borrow Mr. P's pathetick figure of speaking, p. 80. thus: *And that which is more to be wondered at, this miserable man, even while he denies G. F. to be a false Prophet or Impostor, doth manifestly assert him to be a Deluder and Blasphemer. I heartily pity the man, and am really affraid he has overcharged the strength of his brain; for with me such manifest contradiction is but a*

smaller degree of distraction. O stupendous folly!
Thus doth Mr. P. treat his Adversary.

These passages, out of many more of the same complexion, I have taken out of *W. P.*'s vindication of *G. F.* from the first instance of Scripture mis-recited (in his language corrupted) taken from *John 3.9.* which may be by me applyed to them according to truth; but are by *W. P.* to me, by abuse of my Words and Person, as may easily be perceived by any intelligent Reader. But that which is matter of wonder (if any thing be so in this Author) is, That he spends near two and thirty pages upon this Head, and concerning the Light, and not one word (that I can perceive) whereby *G. F.* is any way vindicated from my chief exception; which lay in this, *That every man whom the Light lighteth, is not of necessity or effectually enlightened:* But *G. F.* reads it, *Every man that cometh into the World is enlightened.* I added, for explanation of my sense, (*Rom. 2. 4.*) *That the goodness of God leadeth--to repentance those that are impenitent, and not led to repentance.* I added moreover, *Mat. 5. 15.* and *Luk. 11. 33. & 36.* but of this Mr. P. hath deep silence. He spends near 16 pages about the translation and reference of *ἐγένετο*, *coming*, whether to *Man*, or to *the Light*; and about the translation of *φωτίζει*, *lighteth* or *enlightneth*; which were transiently mentioned by me in less than three lines, and not insisted on, and may be determin'd either way without prejudice to my chief Exception. He joyns *Greece* and *Italy* together, (calling me *Pseudo-linguist*) to abuse me for my use of the *Greek-Tongue*, yet has not charged me with any error therein, which himself or his Authors have not recanted. I said that *ἐγένετο* *coming*, *might*

might refer to τὸ φῶς, the Light, as well as to ἄνθρωπον, Man: He wonders that a man so mean in that Tongue, should undertake to thwart the current of all indifferent Translators. He ostentates his skill in the Oriental Tongues out of the Latin Translations of them, (which Tongue, by the way, cannot render the Greek of this Text so well as our English can.) The question is concerning the Greek: The Arabick and Æthiopick (as he cites them) are on my side: The three French, and the Low-Dutch Translations (as he renders them) are for me. Erasmus grants that the sense is ambiguous, (which is as much in effect as I say) Mr. P. in translating Erasmus's words, faith, *too ambiguous*, wherein he wrongs Erasmus: — *Ambiguitatem sufficit.*

New Academy at Paris?

His Maldonate faith, *My sense is neither false nor absurd.* Grotius faith, *I do much approve of the Exposition, which is extant in Cyril and Augustine, that this ἐγχόμενον, COMING, be referred to τὸ φῶς, THE LIGHT,* Dr. Hamond reads it so. And are not these four indifferent Translators and Expositors? Did they not all own the eternal Divinity of Christ? And did not Mr. P. know it? Let the Reader judge whether he doth not knowingly abuse me? and whether he has not abus'd him too, in writing so much to no purpose?

As for the difference between *light* and *enlighten-*
est, I stood not upon it; but now, after all his im-

What an unworthy thing is it in W. P. to intimate, p. 67. that I would have the Text rendered, *Hac est lux illa vere, qua venientem in mundum illuminat omnem hominem?*

pertinent labour, I say, There is as much difference between these words, as between *destroy this Temple*, and *destroy ye the Temple*; and our Translators seem to use the word *lightreth*, for the *Gospel preached*; and the word *enlightreth*, for the *Gospel received and believed*. *W. P.* deals here like a cunning Lawyer, who having a bad Cause, labours hard to turn off the Judges from the Matter in issue, to something that is not so. In order to that, another Artifice he useth is, To make an hideous out-cry against me, as a Socinian, Mungrel-Socinian, Bidlean, and other frightful names; as if it were a sufficient vindication of *G. F.* from the charge I have prov'd against him, out of his own Writings, that I am an Erronius or Heretical Person. Let me be all that *W. P.* saith I am, a Turk, a Jew, an Anthropomorphyte, an Arrian or Sabellian, or what he will; will *G. F.* his Doctrine be e're the truer, or his Person the wiser or honester? Away with such Mercurial sleights! Here he would fain draw us into the Controversie of his stating, *viz. Whether the Light be natural and created, or supernatural and eternal?* Into which if we should be so foolish as to follow him, I dare say we might have work enough for a full age, and be never the wiser at last; For how is it possible to come to any determination with one that is equivocating in his terms? as I shall shew the *Quakers* to be.

Next he falls upon my Concessions concerning the Light in every man, and pleases himself hugely in making me contradict my self, and give away my Cause: But it's no great matter, for one that is wont to equivocate in his own words, to make his Neighbours contradictory by the same art.

And

And, 2. if it should appear that I had failed in expressing my mind concerning that matter, yet still the Argument of my ~~Book~~ might be firm and valid against G. F. Here under this Head, upon my sober appeal to the Light in the *Quakers*, he falls (as it were) into an extacy, and cries out *monstrum horrendum!* (as if some Poetick Deity had inspir'd him): Why! what's the matter? He saith, *That man which a man makes an appeal, must be capable of giving an infallible judgment, and so a true Judge, or else be appeals foolishly.* Answ. It seems, when *Paul* appealed to *Cesar*, that is, *Nero*, that *Nero* was capable of giving an infallible judgment, or else *Paul* appealed foolishly. Do not all men know that Appeals are made to men upon the account of necessity or convenience, not upon an opinion of his infallibility to whom the appeal is made? Doth not Mr. *P.* reason like a man in a fright? 2. He saith, that *G. F.* is by the verdict of that Light in them, pronounced *not guilty*; and I tell him, that *G. F.* is by the verdict of the Light in me, and as many thousands as the *Quakers* pronounced *Guilty*: On which side now is the infallible judgment? or, are we both infallible? What trifling is here with terms and words! Upon the question it self, of the Light in every man, I have in effect discours'd already, when we consider'd *W. P.*'s Position touching the Unerring Judge, &c. I add further, That every man that grows up to years of discretion, has a capacity, by Nature or otherwise, to know so much of Gods Will, concerning his Duty, as whereby his honesty and sincerity may be tryed. 2. That he that is faithful in the obedience of that knowledge he has, shall have more. 3. That such an one (as was *Cornelius*,

Act. 10.) who feareth God, and worketh Righteouſness, ſhall be accepted of him. But, 4. that ſuch a person may be yet without the Knowledge or Faith of Jesus the Mediator between God and men. And, 5. that God did not to *Cornelius*, neither was wont in those Primitive times, nor doth he in these dayes (that can be made to appear) reveal unto ſuch men inwardly by his Spirit, the knowledge of Christ the Mediator; which was contained in thoſe words which *Peter* preached to *Cornelius*, whereby he and his Houſe were to be ſaved. 6. I ſay, That that knowledge in thoſe words are conveyed to us by the Holy Scriptures, as unto *Cornelius* by word of mouth. 7. I ſay, That the *Quakers* in vilifying *the knowledge from tradition, and the profession of the Person of Christ by tradition*, and contending for an immediate revelation of this Knowledge, do vilifie the dispensation of the Gospel by the Mediator Jesus, and his Apostles and Evangelists their Preaching and Writing. These things are evident, partly by themſelves, partly by Scripture, as *Act. 10. & 11. Mat. 25. Rom. 2.*

Now let us look into Mr. *P.* and his Associates, their ſense of that Doctrine they ſo much glory in, and upon the account of which they ſing ſuch loud tryumphs in the World, viz. *The Light in every man is infallible, and they that are not infallible, are Deluders.* For we ſhall deceive our ſelves, if we think we understand them, when we understand the words in one ſense. 1. Then you muſt know that by the term *Light*, ſometime they mean *Christ*; ſo, when they ſay, *the Light is ſupernatural and eternal*, they mean by *the Light, Christ*, that is, *God*; See p. 68, &c. and the ſense is, *God is ſupernatural and eternal, and God is infallible*:

Who

Who ever denied it? But, 2. when they say, *the Light justifies or condemns*, then they mean that which we call Conscience, for so G. F. expounds it, (*Myth* p. 11.) saying, *And the Light condemns, which you call Conscience.* Suitable to this sense, when a man proceeds rightly in the use of his faculties, and those means which God affords him, and attains to a true knowledge, then he is infallible, and the Light, that is, his Judgment is infallible: But when he doth not proceed rightly, and gives a wrong judgment, then he is fallible, and his Judgment fallible, but not the Light. And so the sense of their Position, *The Light is infallible*, (when they do not mean by *the Light*, God) is, that true knowledge or true judgment, is true knowledge or true judgment. And Mr. P. has unhappily, (by being a little more open than their Doctrine will bear) utterly betray'd both his Cause and his Friends: For thus he saith, (p. 82.) *Infallibility of persons, any further then as they are joyned and conformed to the Light of God, we never affirmed; and fallibility of the Light, because of the fallibility of persons, we never owned.* That is to say, when G. F. and W. P. preach nothing for truth, but what they certainly know to be so, then, and in that point they give a true judgment; and are infallible; [and so is every man in the World] so are G. F.'s Adversaries;] but when they give a false judgment, thinking it to be true, then they are fallible: He might as well have said, *They that are infallible, are infallible; and on the contrary, They that are infallible, are fallible; and they that are fallible, are infallible;* for there is nothing hinders, but that the same person may be infallible in some things, and fallible in many things; for nothing is more common, than for

the

the same person to follow the Light of God in one thing, and neglect it in another. When G. F. quoted Scripture right, then he did conform to the Light of God, which told him he ought to do so, and was infallible : But when he quoted it wrong, then he was not conformed to the Light of God, but fallible. Behold here the *Quakers* Doctrine of Infallibility ! May we not retort then G. F's words ? *How can he but delude people, since he is not infallible ?* But they have yet a third sense of the term *Light*, when they say, it is infallible, and that is this ; *The light in every man, is the immediate Teaching or Speaking of God in every man ; and that is always infallible.* Answ. I have spoken of this before in the Introduction ; And again, 1. I ask, Is the mediate Teaching or Speaking of God, either by Nature or Scripture, fallible ? I hope not. 2. Mr. P. grants, p. 72. That *men may, through their sins and infirmities, mistake, and not perceive the teaching of the Light, and so not conform it ; and then they are fallible like us or other men.* 3. This is that which I said in my Epistle, If God be pleased in a mediatory way, by such very vile means (in the *Quakers* account) as the foolishness of Preaching, and traditional Scripture to teach men sufficiently ; and if they despise that way, must God be bound to supply their pride and idleness by his immediate Teaching ? which when he has done, they are still as liable as other men to be inconformable to it. And so this their great Doctrine of infallibility comes to nothing but equivocation, noise and wind. Their persons W. P. in contradiction to G. F. grants to be fallible ; their *Light within*, when it is taken for the last Dictate of their understanding, (which men are obliged always to follow)

follow) for whatsoever is not of Faith, is sin) Mr. P. grants to be also fallible. And why may not I now retort his exprobation? Well! before I would undertake Controversies, and thus give away my Cause, may, so wofully, yet frequently contradict my self, [and my Friends] I would never write while I live.

These things thus discoursed, to follow Mr. P. though they are a digression from my Argument, yet I hope not unprofitable to the Reader. We may now proceed to his Answers upon the particular Instances, and show that even in those that are of least moment, his Vindications of G. F. and his contemptuous Speeches against me for the slightness of the Objection, do all fall heavily upon his Prophet George. For I have him upon this *Dilemma*: If the Instances I have produced of G. F.'s mis-citings of Scripture, be indeed pervertings and corruptings of Scripture, then G. F. is fallible and a Deluder; if they be not, then also he is fallible and a Deluder, because he has judg'd them and the like to be so in his Adversaries. So that if I had hir'd W. P. to have wrote in deference of my Argument, and in aggravation of G. F.'s folly, I'm confident he could not have it done more effectually, than he hath in this his Book, where he denies the Antecedent, namely, That such mis-citings are pervertings, which he doth almost in every instance. It would tire the Reader to pass through them all, we will try it in some few of them, that are in his esteem of the most trivial account.

1. And the first shall be that from *Ephes*.

2. 6. where for in *Christ Jesus*, G. F. W.P. p. 133. puts with him. Here I said there might be a different sense: but however G. F. chargeth the Translators for corrupting Scripture, because they had

had translated ἐν πυρεάσιν, (Jud. 14.) with ten thousands, and not in. The like corruption he finds in the Translation of Matth. 3. 11. with water for in water. Now I appeal to any Reader that understands English, whether it was not as great a corruption in G. F. to put with for in, where both the Greek and English had in, as for the Translators to translate the Greek ἐν by with. Now let us see W. P.'s defence retorted. First, G. F. wrongs the Translators in saying, they have corrupted the Scriptures, by putting with for in, since there is no difference at all in what he would fantastically have to be one. — And with such arrogance doth G. F. charge the Translators with corrupting Scripture, as if he were the only Master of the Sentences, Doctor of the Chair, or grand Critick of the Age, who, to speak truth, shews himself a Scholar much at the same rate, and by the same figure that Pedlars are called Merchants. Save that he comes short in this, that he knows not a piece of Stuff from a piece of Silks, not one clause from another.

Next, 2 Pet. 2. 1. Denying the Lord W. P. p. 117. that bought them; where he inserts Christ, and yet perhaps it may be meant of denying the Father. Now is not this as great a perversion of the Text, as the saying, *destroy ye this Temple*, instead of *destroy this Temple*. Besides, this countenances their Doctrine of the Father and Christ their being so one, as that they are not distinct. Let us hear W. P. now.

We may guess at his meaning without an interpretation; But must Christ be Lord and not Lord, [distinct and not distinct] at every turn, when this presumptuous person G. F. will? — In short, If a mans expressing ye, where it must be understood, must conclude

conclude him a perverter of Scripture, and consequently a Deluder and Blasphemer, Who is true? Let all the World read, and observe of what ungodly stuff, and very trash his [Mystery Book] doth consist!

3. G. F. ranks it among Scriptures corrupted by the Translators, that they render Col. 1. 23. *The Gospel which was preached to every Creature*; and himself (in contradiction to him that asserted that the Gospel is not first made known by the seeing within, but by hearing tydings without) renders it, *The Gospel is preached in every Creature*, where he puts *is* for *was*, and *in* for *to*. Now *W. P.* (p. 121.) doth not deny the change; but sayes, that *is* and *was* are both true. He sayes also that *in* every Creature, and *to* every Creature, may be the same. What now? How can it be a corruption of Scripture in the Translators, to render it *to*, if it be the same with *in*? *W. P.* seems in this, and indeed in the sum of his Vindication, to have writ by immediate inspiration; that is, what came next to his fancy, without consideration of its being for him or against him. Well! what's his censure against me, which lights upon *G. F.*? *His carping there is like all the rest, malicious and troublosom.* It seems *G. F.* is a malicious and troublosom Prophet.

Thus I might go through all the instances, and present *W. P.* wounding and goring himself and Friend upon the Horns of my Argument, but the Reader will easily excuse me from that travel, and do it himself in his own mind. And yet methinks I cannot but note one more of his *mercurial watchings*: (He'll go near to charge me with palpable lying, (as he has done divers times in the like case) for this common phrase, because I say, *I cannot*, when I can).

It

It is in my p. 33. in his p. 226. where I fault G. F. for saying absolutely, God said, *Job did not sin with his mouth*, where the Scripture saith, *In all this did not Job sin with his lips*: Now my exception lies in those words, *In all this*, which *W. P.* according to his wonted honesty, leaves out, and gives out, that my exception lies in the putting of *mouth* *P. 1274* for *lips*, and that I charge G. F. with imposture on that account, when as he has found as great a change as that in Christ and his Apostles their quoting of Scripture. Well! suppose (what is not) that my exception had been that; Is it not as great a corrupting of Scripture, to put *truth* for *lips*, as to put *to* for *in*, where Mr. *P.* saith, *To and In, may be the same*; or as, *destroy ye*, for *destroy (ye understood)*. Thus all the foul play that *W. P.* can use, will not excuse his good Friend; but every blow that he strikes at me, wounds G. F. mortally. But the most deadly of all comes at last; 'tis this, (without change of his Argument) *If Christ and his Apostles have not observed such exactness as [Gr. Fox] so severely reprobates [his Adversaries] for the want of. It is to be hoped, that he will either retract his unscrupulous abuse — or else not think it hard in us to charge this blasphemous inference upon him, namely, that he makes Christ Jesus and his Apostles perverters of Scripture, and what else he wickedly concludes against Professors.* This inference falls with all its weight upon G. F. as the Reader may readily perceive: But for me, it touches me not at all: For,

First, We will suppose G. F. but equal to Christ and his Apostles, in changing words to the same sense, yet there will be this difference between them. They testified the infallibility of their spirit by many

75

many Miracles, &c. but I never heard of any that G. F. did, except the eating and making one or more meals of Spidars, of which I hear not of any evidence but his own word. 2. Christ never call'd the Scribes and Pharisees Perversers of Scripture, for such change of words as G. F. hath done Professors. 3. Christ did not at the same time challenge the World, and call them forth to come and have their Doctrines tryed by that very Scripture, that is, that Version, or that Copy then in use among them, and which he corrects them for not following exactly in every point, without their meanings, as G. F. has done in his *Mystery*, &c. and *Preface* to the same. Which things considered, are enough to render him (according to his own Judgment) a Deluder and Blasphemer, and *W. P.* no less in making the Parallel; but our Lord and his Apostles innocent.

But, secondly, of fifty instances, there are not above three or four that have not either addition or subtraction both of words and sense, or an alteration of words either importing or countenancing a bad sense, or at least varying from the sense of the place, as I doubt not but will appear to any judicious Reader. And *W. P.* himself, in most of the Instances, doth not deny the various sense, onely he endeavours to make that sense consist with truth in general, or some opinion of their own, which others count error.

Lastly, It's more than Mr. *P.* knows, for all his skill in the Hebrew, (which is very notorious among learned men) whether our Lord and his Apostles in their Citations of Scripture, did not keep to the very words of that Version which was then in use, or allowed by those to whom he spake, and they wrote.

So vast a difference is there between the Citations of Christ and his Apostles, and those of G. F. that it's a most shameful thing they should be brought into comparison. Here I might transcribe much to the bitter condemnation of them out of their own mouths, but I must hasten.

Notwithstanding after Mr. P. has writ a Book stuff with Invectives, and opprobrious condemnations of G. F. his Doctrine and Person, under my Person and Cause, he comes at length, in the end of it, to say something to his purpose of Vitidication, if it were true and reasonable, but it proves no Armour of proof, but a mere Cobweb. He argues thus; *Professors hold the Scripture to be such a sufficient, infallible — Rule, as that God hath not given unto men any thing more clear and certain:* But G. F. and the Quakers hold, *That the eternal Spirit is, by way of excellency, the Rule and Guide of Christians:* Therefore he was not confined to the very express words and points thereof as his Rule.

Could he satisfie his Conscience in this Apology? But I answer, 1. This arguing clearly supposes that the Dictates of G. F's Spirit, are more excellent than the Scriptures. 2. It supposes that the Spirit of God, or God himself, can affirm that to be written which is not written; that is, can lie: for in citing Scripture, men have respect to the very express words, and upon those they build the sense. 3. It supposes that because G. F. has a less esteem of the Scriptures than other men have, therefore he may honestly do that to the Scriptures, which will render other men Perversors and Corruptors of them. 4. It supposes that which is false, viz. That Professors hold the present English Translation to be unalterable,

ble, for G. F. chargeth them with perverting Scripture, for altering it to the very same sense, as both he and they must acknowledge. 5. G. F. chargeth the Translators with corrupting Scripture, for rendering it so as *W. P.* confesseth to be the same with the rendering that G. F. would have, as I shew'd upon *Col. 1. 23.* 6. It seems by this arguing, that when G. F. calls upon other Christians to come forth and be tryed by the Scriptures, we must understand, not the form of sound words contained in the Scriptures, but his interpretation of Scripture :

But they, poor men ! must be charg- *Divinity of*
ed, nay, commanded to give him plain *Christ Pref.*
Scripture, printed Scripture, Chapter

and Verse. What ? though G. F. his words are to *W. P.* of equal, yea, greater authority than the Scriptures, (as proceeding fresh and new from the holy Spirit, but these have pass'd through many foul hands) ; must they therefore be so to other men, that do not acknowledge him led by that Spirit ? When the truth of any matter in question is to be tryed by a written Testimony, and that writing may be produced ; he that shall then, instead of the determinate words of that Testimony, produce other words to the prejudice of his Neighbours cause, shall be counted a forger and lyar. And I nothing doubt, but that G. F. if he had dealt so with other writings of civil concern, as he has done with the holy Scriptures, would by this time have lost his ears. And it would not have excus'd him in such a change, to have urged that his own knowledge and testimony were of greater certainty and vility, than the words of that written Testimony ; forasmuch as the Party concern'd acknowledg'd no such matter. 7. G. F.

in accusing Professors of perverting Scripture in the Instances cited, follows his own Judgment and Principle, and not theirs ; for he makes it an Argument of the *Quakers* their being *sent of God*, because *they speak of Scripture right as it is*, but Professors the contrary ; and tells them, *they run into all absurdities that give their meanings to Scripture*. Lastly, such is the unhappiness of *W. P.*'s undertaking in this matter, that almost all his reasonings and scorings too against me, in vindication of *G. F.* turn directly to his condemnation : For because Professors do not acknowledge any other common Rule of Faith but the Scriptures, it was necessary therefore for *G. F.* to confute them by express Scripture, especially in that he had undertaken so to do, and dar'd them to go to a tryal at that Tribunal. See the Epistle to his *Mystery*. I have been long in the answer of this Allegation, because it seems to be the only thing of weight in his whole Book ; but you see how it deserves him.

Having now seen my Argument against *G. F.* confirm'd and improv'd with much bitterness by *W. P.* under pretence of vindicating him, I might here fairly conclude ; but having added to my Argument (in my Epistle) that he had not only done the same, or the like to that which he condemn'd in others, but much more, and that which was really condemnable, and urg'd my Instances to prove that also, it may perhaps be fit for me to say something in vindication of them, or some of them, from *W. P.*'s exceptions : Though indeed, if the Reader would but take the pains to compare my Epistle with his Answer, and what I have here already written, I might well spare mine and his further labour in this Matter.

Matter. But because every Reader may not have opportunity so to do, I will proceed.

The first instance I have spoken to already.

The second Instance is from *John 1. 7.* where G. F. applies that to the *Light*, which *John* speaks of the *Baptist*, viz. *That all men through him might believe*: Which taken, as it is spoken, proves, that the preaching of *John Baptist*, was a means of bringing all men to believe, and consequently that the true *Light* may light every man by the foolishness of preaching or outward means; which is contrary to the *Quakers* Doctrine of the *Light*, and is avoided by his perverting the *Text*.

The third Inst. is from *2 Cor. 4. 6.* For *God who commanded the Light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts to [give] the Light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.* G. F. hath it thus; *When as Paul said, that the Light which shined in their hearts, to give the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.* 1. He puts the *Light* instead of *God*. 2. He leaves out *Light* immediately before of the *knowledge*. 3. The whole Sentence is non-sense; and notwithstanding all this, *W. P.* has the face to tell his Reader, *He obtrudes an arrant lie upon our very senses*, and calls me, *wretched Scribler!* *How idle?* *How frivolous,* &c. The error that's couch'd here, is, 1. That *God* and *Christ* the *Light* are not distinct, but all one. 2. That by *Light* here is not meant *Knowledge*. 3. That this *Light* is not an effect of *Creation*.

4. Inst. from *Col. 3. 10.* where G. F. reads *them* for *him*, and so takes away from us a proof, that the *New Man* there spoken of, is created. *W. P.* saith, in his defence, *If he did put Them for Him it is not false;*

false; but if we, in common discourse, say *you* for *thou*, he'll say it's false.

(5.) *Rom. 2. 15.* G. F. puts *Conscience* for *Thoughts*, because Conscience was more easily drawn to signify the *uncreated Light in every man*.

(6.) *John 7. 38.* There he puts *Christ's belly* for the *Believers belly*, to countenance the foresaid Nation.

(7.) *2 Cor. 2. 16.* G. F. applies that to the *immediate Word*, which is plainly spoken of *P. 119.* the *Apostles*. And *W. P.* that *be may be true to his way*, of abusing me falsely, faith, I undertake to prove him to be an *Impostor*, for putting *the* before *Death* and *Life*, which the *Translati-*
on doth not. Did ever man make less conscience of what he wrote?

(8.) *Col. 1. 23.* Putting *was* for *is*, to prove inward preaching without outward. I have spoken of it before.

(9.) *2 Cor. 13. 5.* *Within you* for *in you*, to countenance (as he supposes) their *Doctrine of God's immediate Light*.

(10.) *2 Cor. 3. 6.* G. F. faith, The Scripture said, *The Letter was dead and did not give Life*. *W. P.* blames me for referring these words to this Scripture, (which is the nearest I can find) but he finds no Scripture nearer, to which to refer it. How captious he is! *Paul* faith, *The Letter killeth*, (speaking of the first Covenant, as *W. P.* confesseth) but *G. F.* intends, that the outward dispensation of the New Covenant in the Scriptures is dead. An Opinion that has done no small mischief in the World.

(11.) I have charged *G. F.* that twenty times or more (as I suppose) he denies that the Scripture is called

called *Word*, but faith, it is called a *Treatise*, Acts 1. 1. And yet that word there rendred *Treatise*, is the same which is rendred *Word*, when applyed to Christ: But *W. P.* to help at a dead lift, faith, *G. F.* intended, *The Word of God by way of excellency*: Which of *G. F.* his Adversaries did ever affirme it was?

(12.) But *W. P.* can defend him in any thing, even when he obtrudes upon his Reader the grossest absurdity instead of Scripture, and will not have it to be any more than a trivial Objection against his infallible Prophet, when he saith, *And so to the Word Christ Jesus, Him by whom the World was made before it was made.* This *G. F.* puts in a Scripture Letter, and this he repeats in his Book at least seven times without any variation; the eighth time he has it thus, *By which the World was made before it was made.* It's evident enough he has respect to *John 1. 3. Without him was not any thing made that was made.* What saith his Champion now? *But is there no allowance to be had for curt Expressions of a pen, oversight in Compositors, and Errors in the Press?* What! eight times after the same manner? Where was *W. P.*'s Conscience? But can he not make sense of it? Yes, yes: Suppose a *Comma* at the first made, where and being understood, explaineth the sense, was *make* it more clear: That's one way. Again, Take the middle Clause and put it last, interchanging the *World* and *it*, thus: *And so to the Word Christ Jesus, before the World was made, him by whom it was made.* All this stir is to make it tenable, (as for Scripture, 'tis such as God's infallible Spurke in *G. F.* writes) And may not a man at this rate excuse the grossest non-sense that ever was writ? Go

thy wayes for an admirable Advocate ! Once more let me ask the Reader what he thinks of the honesty of *W. P.* and whether he will excuse me hence-forward, if I mingle any more Discourse with him ? It may benefit some or other, therefore I will yet proceed a little further.

(13.) Who can read *Deut.* 30. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. and not perceive that by *the word very nigh unto them in their mouth and in their heart*, is meant, the Word written ? And yet *G. F.* would have it to be the inward immediate Word, and therefore *in thy mouth*, must be left out as not well agreeing with that notion.

(14.) It's for the sake of that Notion, that *the Power of God* is said by him to be *the Gospel*, and *the Gospel the Power of God*, as if they were convertible terms ; whereas the Apostle *Paul* sayes only, That the Gospel is *the Power of God* (not simply and absolutely but in a certain respect) *to Salvation to every one that believeth* ; This I express't fully in my Epistle, but *W. P.* would not see it, but cries out, *Gross folly, &c.*

(15.) Next you must know that the *Quakers* detest the thought of Christ's having the Essence of a man in any place remote from their own dear hearts, and therefore when *G. F.* cites that Scripture, *Luk.* 24. 5, 6. He must leave out of the very heart of the Text, *He is not here* : And *W. P.* will have it very aptly used to express the Mystical Resurrection : but still *he is not here* must be out, for that doth not quadrate with their fancy.

(16.) And *G. F.* cites that Text (*Ephes.* 5. 30.) defectively, to prove Christ not absent from his Church, and *W. P.* avows it. Indeed *G. F.* sayes,

He is deceived, who faith, *Christ is diſtinct from the Saints*, *Myst.* p. 16.

(17.) But upon that Text, *Luk. 17. 21.* W. P. gives my chief exception a go-by, takes no notice of G. F.'s changing, *The Kingdom of God into plain Heaven.* But if he had, he abhors to think that *Heaven is a viſible place to be liv'd in, bearing ſome reſemblance to this viſible World,* p. 12.

(18.) *Amos 3. 13.* There G. F.'s applying that to Christ, which is spoken of the Lord God, favours their Doctrine of no diſtinction between God and Jesus Christ the Mediator, and W. P. defends it on that account.

(19.) The like may be faid of *1 Cor. 15. 28.* where W. P. according to his usual candour, tells me of *Col. 3. 11.* but takes no notice of G. F. his citing Chapter and Verse, which he is not wont to do.

(20.) *Joh. 1. 1. God is the Word,* is defended by the fame perverse Doctrine.

(21.) So is his adding *He or Christ to the Father,* *Joh. 10. 29.*

(22.) His palpable diſminiſhing from *Phil. 2. 11.* hath the fame tendency, and W. P. owns it, G. F. in his own Cause, would have exclaiomed here, as he doth upon the Ministers of *Newcastle.*

(23.) W. P. talks of *Brazen*--but I wonder with what face he could give ſuch anſwer to *John 15. 25.* which if it be not (as G. F. cites it) an addition to Scripture, I never ſaw one, nor ever ſhall. What? call for plain Scripture from another, and at the fame instant urge Scripture with addition himſelf! He thinks if he can but make G. F. ſpeak ſenſe, and truth in his Opinion, he has done enough. He may

as

as well say, all G. F's Book is Scripture, for he believes it all as infallible as Scripture, as if there were no difference between a Quotation, and a Comment or Exposition. But G. F. has said it, *Christ is not distinct from the Father*: That's enough for W. P. though it subvert the Gospel.

(24.) The like ground there is for inserting *Christ* into the Text, 2 Pet. 2. 1. which I have mentioned.

(25.) And for putting *God* for *Lord*, Rom. 14. 9.

(26.) And so he would confound *God* and the *Holy Spirit* by putting the one for the other, 1 Cor. 2. 10, 14. And why did not W. P. answer what I urg'd, rather then pass it by, and call me *Busy-body*, which is very easie.

(27.) Add to these Col. 3. 16. and John 17. 5. (which I am about to speak) and we have 11 Texts abused to serve that goodly Doctrine of the Father, Son, and Spirit, their not being distinct but all one: A very trivial Matter that doth but subvert the Faith of Christ, and introduce another Gospel.

(28.) When G. F. sayes, This is Scripture, If we find it not there, we must say, He is mistaken, and then he is fallible. If he give us the sense of Scripture in other words, and obtrude them for Scripture, he corrects the Scripture instead of citing it. Christ saith, John 17. 5. *And now, O Father, glorifie thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the World was.* But G. F. *Christ who was glorified with the Father before the World began.* W. P. cries out, *Sottish Ignorance and Enmity with a witness!* Did ever Christ or his Apostles, or any sober man living, chide or reprove a person, if - be

he did leave out or put in, or change a word, not in the least perverting the sense? Yes, G. F. doth it, for expressing ye, where it must be understood. It seems then G. F. is no sober man in W. P's account; and if so, I know not how he should be a true Prophet. But I have shew'd in my Epistle, that he perverts the sense, and that the Phrase is to be understood of the glory which Jesus had, not in possession, but in decree with the Father, before the World was. Here Mr. P. cries out lamentably, *That ever any man should undertake to correct others in that which doth not deserve it, whilst the beam is in his own eye, and is himself most guilty!* This is like the rest, suitable to the honesty of Mr. P. that he should compare an Exposition of Scripture with a quotation of it. And because the chief artifice of his Book, is to render me odious and detestable under the name of *Socinian, mongrel-Socinian, Bidleian*, and the like, and for that takes no small occasion from my exposition of this Text; I shall shew, 1. that two great Authors, no *Socinians*, are of the same mind. *Grotius* upon those words, *The glory which, I had*, adds,

Destinatione tua, in thy Decree. *Augustinus, Et nunc clarifica me, And now glorifie me: Hoc est, sicut sunt, ita & nunc; sicut sunt prædestinatione, sic & nunc perfectione;* That is, as then, so also now; as then in Prædestination, so also now in Perfection. Secondly, I shall

He chargeth me (p. 61.) with driving at the *Dire-stigating Christ* of all right to eternal Divinity: This is learned non-sense; G. F's spirit could never elevate him to such a degree of Jargon: Besides, except he can produce some Author for it, (which I am perswaded he cannot) I shall conclude him the first that ever us'd the word *dire-stigate*, or *dire-stigare*, in any sense what-so-ever. cr.

shall declare the Opinion of the Leading *Quakers* concerning the Essence or Being of our Lord and Mediator Jesus Christ, so far as the equivocation of their Writings will permit. And it was as much as all the reputation of the *Quakers* is worth to be plain in this point, therefore we must not expect it from them.

First, Then for the God-head or Divinity of Christ, in the confession whereof Mr. P. and G. W. do so much glory and boast; Mr. P. in his *Sandy Foundation*, hath brought many Texts of Scripture,

Though the word One is not in the Hebrew in some Texts, where he so confidently puts an Emphasis. right Reason, to prove that *God is the Holy ONE, not a Holy THREE; that ONE is God, and God only is that Holy ONE:* He rejects there that *impertinent distinction,*

that he [God] is ONE in Substance, but THREE in Persons or Subsistencies. G. Whitehead defends this Position of W. P. in his Book called, *The Divinity of Christ*, where in the Name of the *Quakers* he confesseth, " That there are Three that bear Record " in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit, " and that these Three are One, both in Divinity, " Divine Substance, and Essence; not three Gods, " nor seperate Beeings. *That they are called by several Names in Scripture, as manifest to and in the Saints, --and are-- One infinite Wisdom, One Power, One Love, one Light and Life, &c.* I should have given G. F. the preheminence, for I believe he is the Author of this Opinion among the *Quakers*; he saith, (*Myst. p. 142.*) *Christ is not distinct from the Father;* and p. 199. *they are not only One, but all One.*

Hence

Hence it is manifest, 1. that when they say, *Christ is God*, they mean nothing by *Christ*, neither Substance nor Essence, Person nor Subsistent, (especially in the sense of their Adversaries) Wisdom or Power, Light or Life, or any thing else that is really distinct from that which the Jews mean by *the God of Israel*, or the Mahometans by *one God*. He that believes less, must be an Atheist.

2. That the Propositions, *Christ is God*, and *the Father is God*, are of the very same import and signification, even as to say, *W. P.* is a Man, or, *The Author of the Sandy Foundation* is a Man. So that (respecting the time before Jesus was born) the Father, the Son, or Christ, did as much signify one and the same intelligent and happy Person or Hypostasis, as *Paul* and the Apostle of the Gentiles, the same individual Man or Person. And this is that Opinion which Ecclesiastical Writers attribute to *Sabellius*, and they that maintain it, are called by them *Sabellians*. The consequence whereof is that, the Son of God, or Christ as God, was at that time nothing but another Name of God or the Father, and had no more Life, Knowledge, Power or Property distinct from the Life, Knowledge, Power or Properties of God, or the Father, than he that is not, has from him that is. And so all that the *Quakers* contend for, (when they seem so zealous for the Divinity of Christ) is nothing in the World, (beside their own glory, and the disparagement of their Adversaries) save that God, or the Father, was or might be in those dayes called *Christ*, or *the Son of God*, or *the Light*, &c.

Thus much touching the Divinity of Christ, according to the Leading *Quakers*. Now for his Humanity,

manity, or his being a Man. And we shall find, that what-ever W. P. talks of Christ, *as Man*, and *as God*, yet that he equivocates and deludes his Reader, believing no such thing as Christ his being a Man; or else he dissent from his Brethren, which I suppose he will not own.

1. G. F. (for it's fit he should lead) doth in an insulting manner crow over his Antagonists, for using the word *Humane*, when they speak of the Nature of Christ, (see my Epistle, p. 37.) *Where doth the Scripture* (saith he) *speak of Humane?* the word *Humane*? In his Epistle before *the Divinity of Christ*. *Is God a Man?* No, he is a *Spirit*. — *Is the Holy Ghost a Man?* It is called the *Holy Spirit*; and *Christ was a Man, the Man Christ Jesus*. If G. F. believed Christ to be now a man, why did he not retain the Present Tense *is*, but change it into *was*, very roughly? But that which we find in the Postscript of that Epistle, will put the matter out of question, where that Author, out of Scripture, denieth a person to be — *a Man or Woman; sometime the Body, the Face, or visible appearance of either*: He cites many Texts out of the Old Testament, for that use of the word Person, and saith, that in the New it *is mentioned with the same acceptation as before in the Old*. *As for instance*, (saith he) *Thou regardest not the Person of Men*, Mat. 22. 16. Mark 12. 14. Luk. 20. 21. *In the Greek it is* $\tau\omega\gamma\omega\pi\tau\omega\alpha\pi\theta\pi\omega\pi\tau\omega$, i.e. *faciem hominum*, *the face of men*; (he cites Gal. 2. 6. 2 Cor. 1. 11. Jud. 16. where the same word is rendered *Person*) and concludes, *That the word Persons is attributed to men*. How now? If Christ is a Man, and a Man is a Person, will not Christ be then a Person? No such matter, according

to these mens Logicks, for immediately he goes about to vindicate the Greek Text, 2 Cor. 2.10. from being translated *Person* of Christ, and says, it is translated *face* of Christ, or *sight* of Christ; and our Poly-glottist W. P. faith, p. 11. *Christ's Person is (strictly considered) an unscriptural expression, and will needs make me manifestly guilty of perverting Scripture for using it.* But what weight there is in his friends answer to that Text I see not; for if a Person be a *Man*, or the *face* of a *Man* (as he defines it); then if Christ be a *Man*, he will be a Person, and his *face* will be the *face* of a Person: And if Christ be not a Person, then he is not a *Man*; for the definition of a thing, and the thing defined, are convertible. But that they do absolutely deny Christ to be a Person or *Man*, I prove further, out of G. W's Book, *Christ Ascended*, p. 24. "This manner (saith he) of excluding God's right hand, and Christ to a limitation out of his People in a *personal Being*, (which are no Scripture terms) still implies him to be a *personal God or Christ*; like the Anthropomorphites and Muggletonians conceits of him. Where note, that he doth with equal contempt, reject a *personal Christ* as a *personal God*, and so Christ is no more a Person than God, and consequently no more a *Man*, for they deny God to be a Person.

Again, p. 31. *Is the Essence or Being of the Son of God personal?* And p. 37. He challengeth his Adversaries, saying, *What rule in Scripture hast thou for these words, [visible God, visible Christ, &c.]* And a little below, *Thou like the old heretical Egyptian Monks,*

(the

Yet eight lines after, himself confounds and abuses Scripture, Heb. 2.16. with Rom. 4.5.

(the *Antropomorphites*, and late *Muggletonians*) art telling of a *visible God*, and *Christ remote, not in any*. Behold here what an abominable thought it is to this man, and the *Family of Light, called Quakers*, (that's his phrase) that *Jesus Christ should be like a Man, visible, or in any place remote from Men and Women that live here upon Earth*; and if he be not, then it's certain he is not a *Man*; for a *Man* being in his *Substance, Body, as well as Spirit, and finite*, cannot be in *more* than one place at the same time. And Mr. P. talks at the same rate (with G. W.) P. 12. Sect. 6. where he argues thus, *If Gods presence make the Heaven, as we have been always taught, and all have believed and confess*; [let every Reader judge whether he say true or false.] Do not all Christians in the World (except a few) believe and confess that *Heaven is a certain place, (distinct from Earth) into which Christ ascended, when a Cloud received him out of their (the Apostles) sight, Acts 1. 9.*] *Then (saith he) since God vouchsafes to Temple and Tabernacle in men, it follows, that his Heaven is there also.* And so the *Man Christ Jesus* sits at *Gods right hand in Heaven*, when *W. P. sits at G. F's right hand, for God Tabernacles in G. F. and hath his Heaven there, and Christ is in W. P.* or else there's no such thing as *Christ's being a Man*. Here *W. P. derides and abominates their Faith, who believe, That Heaven is a visible place to be liv'd in, &c.*

But we will return again to G. W's *Christ Ascended*, p. 18. --- *Except you eat my Flesh, and drink my Blood, you have no Life in you, saith Christ, --- So neither is Christ, nor Gods right hand, so limited so a remoteness from them [the Saints.]* It seems that

that Jesus Christ is no otherwise in Heaven, then he is in the Saints, when they eat his Flesh, and drink his Blood. And indeed *J. Newman's* design was from what appears in *G. W.'s* Book to assert, That the Man Jesus our Lord, although he is the Eternal God, has in Heaven, a place remote from Earth, an Humane Body, which is not substantially in any Man, nor in any place, but in that which all men call Heaven. To this *G. W.* opposeth himself, and saith, p. 21. *Doth not this oppose the Infiniteness and Omnipresence of God and Jesus Christ, and bring them under the limitation of finite Creatures.* So that Jesus Christ (according to him) has no other Body of a Man, than what is as Infinite and Omnipresent as God himself.

Next we will see what *Isaac Pennington* (another famous man) saith to this Point; in his Book intituled, *A Question, &c.* p. 33. — *The Scriptures do expressly distinguish between Christ and the Garment which he wore; between him that came, and the Body in which he came.* So then Christ's Body, by which he means the whole Manhood, was but Christ's Garment.

A little farther he saith, *This we certainly know, and can never call the bodily Garment Christ, but that which appeared and dwelt in the body.*

To this agrees our Author *W. P.* (p. 11.) *We dare not say, That the intire Christ was that visible Body that was crucified at Jerusalem.* What was then? *J. Pennington* will tell us in his next words; *Now if ye (Professors) indeed know the Christ of God, tell us plainly what that is which appeared in the Body? whether that was not the Christ before it took up the Body, after it took up the Body, and for ever?*

Here it's manifest, that by *Christ* he understands nothing of Manhood, Body nor Soul, but only that which was before Jesus was born, and the same is still the Christ, his Body or Manhood was only his Garment, which he took up and laid down. And *G. W.* useth the word *Manhood*; p. 14. *He took upon him the Manhood in time.*

Now I may appeal to my Reader, whether I have not clearly prov'd (as far as the nature of the thing will bear) that the Leading *Quakers* do not believe that Jesus Christ is a man: I say, as the nature of the thing will bear, because if they should in so many Syllables deny it, (though I have had it so from some of their mouths) they must contradict express Scripture, which often calls Christ a Man, even since his Resurrection; and that would destroy their reputation among those that reverence the Holy Scriptures. But how they can, by an unparallel'd equivocation, both confess him in Scripture to be a Man, and at the same time, in Heart, and in their Books, deny him, I shall now shew you, out of the Books of *Isaac Pennington*, and *G. Fox* aforesaid.

I. P. p. 20. *For that which he (Christ) took upon him, was our Garment, even the Flesh and Blood of our Nature, which is of an earthly perishing Nature; but he is of an eternal Nature, and his Flesh, and Blood, and Bones, are of his Nature.* Here observe, that the Flesh and Blood of our Nature, that is, the Manhood which he took upon him, was a Garment, and so no part of his Nature; but he had Flesh, and Blood, and Bones too before that time; which Flesh, Blood, and Bones, were of an Eternal Nature; that is to say, God; for I know nothing else that was of an Eternal Nature.

Here

Here Christ is denied to be by Nature a Man, and yet by his Eternal Nature to have Flesh, Blood, and Bones. Now if any man in the World can shew me a grosser piece of equivocation than this, I will acknowledge my self a very ignorant Person: To speak of the Flesh, Blood, and Bones of a Man, and to intend nothing of the Nature of Man, but only of God. Has *Muggleton*, or the Anthropomorphites of *Egypt* (whom they so often call upon) said any thing of so gross a nature as this, if it be taken properly? and if it must be taken improperly, what horrid deceit and equivocation?

But it were a disparagement to *G. F.* that *I. P.* should have a Notion that was not first revealed to *G. F.* Therefore we find that long before, *G. F.* had said in his *Mystery*, p. 68. — *And is not Christ in Man? And daib not Christ say, they must eat his Flesh? And so if they must eat his Flesh, Is not his Flesh in them? — And how can ye call him Christ in Man, without the Man be there?* *I. P.*'s words may be the exposition of these, and tell us, that by *Man*, *G. F.* means the Eternal God, and by the *Flesh* which men eat, and which is in them, he means the *Flesh, Blood, and Bones* of the Eternal God. Who can read these things without horror? Now let me put two or three Queries to my Reader, which he may resolve from these Premises.

Q. First, Of what use is or can the Scripture be to these men, who do thus confound Heaven and Earth, God and Man, Flesh and Spirit, Man's Nature, and God's Nature, Eternity and Time, that they will understand the one, when the other is named and plainly spoken of? And for so doing, pretend the guidance of God's infallible Spirit? And

W. P. tells us, p. 38. 'Tis their Principle, *That the Eternal Spirit, (their Guide and Rule), who in several Generations hath revealed a great part [it seems, not all] of the things contained in Non-sense as was observed before.* the *Scriptures to be superior to those Writings;* and below that, *The Scripture is much like the shadow of the true Rule.* I say, of what use can this shadow of a Rule be to these Persons?

2. Whether I did not take the most proper way of dealing with these men in my Epistle, shewing to their senses, that G. F. in his Ministry had asserted for Written and Spoken, that which is not Written nor Spoken?

3. Whether any ingenuous man could express a charge more modestly than I did, when I said, — *You seem at least to deny his Person,* seeing I have now, and could then have prov'd, that they not only seem to deny Christ's Person, but do effectually deny it, both in the sense of their Adversaries, and in their own sense of that word?

4. Whether Mr. Pen be not either a very weak man, or was not in a great rage, or both, that he should write such a Book as this I have in hand, when he might know before what I could produce against them? For he might easily imagine that I could have recourse to that Christian Letter, wherein these things had been represented to him; which he received above twelve moniths agoe, and takes no notice of.

5. Whether he will impute it to Mr. P's want of all honesty and good Conscience, or to a transport of Passion and Revenge, that he makes such hideous out-cries of Sacrilege and Ingratitude toward Christ.

Christ Jesus, against those he calls *Mongrel-Socinians*, because they will not own that God was called *Christ* before Jesus was born ; and in the mean time himself to deny whatsoever of Essence, Substance, Person, Power, Life or Happiness is attributable to Jesus, as he is the Mediator between God and Men ?

Lastly, Whether the Reader will not freely give me, himself and all other Christians, a *Supersedeas* or Dispensation from ever writing or speaking any more about matters of Religion to such men that deny the Conclusion, when their senses evidence all the Premises ; that condemn that falsity in other men, which they excuse in themselves ; that palpably belie other men, to get glory to themselves ; that deny Christ totally under his name and pretence of Zeal for his Divinity ; finally, that are such notorious Equivocators as I have manifestly prov'd these men to be ?

Nevertheless, because Mr. P. has made it his great study to render me & consequently what I have said (thought 'tis inco^rsequent enough) odious & detestable, under the name of *Socinian*, *Bidleian*, and the like, although I wrote nothing but what was approved by men of learning and piety, and strangers to me, and (for ought I know) to all my Friends : I will therefore present to the Reader a short account of these mens opinion concerning Christ, who for distinction sake call themselves *Unitarians*, being so called in those places, where by the Laws of the Countrey they have equal liberty of Religion with other men, or because they own but one Person, and one Substance or Essence of the most High and Independent God, and to distinguish them from

other Christians that hold Three Persons, and one Essence of God, and are therefore denominated *Trinitarians*.

I say therefore, that they are very zealous Affiliators of the Unity of God, and that is the reason (as they solemnly profess) why they cannot allow of three Persons in the God-head, because they think it destroys his Unity or Oneness ; and I have shew'd that the *Quakers* (W. P. especially) do also disallow them. Notwithstanding the *Quakers*, according to their equivocating manner, can call God the Father by the Name of *Christ*, and the other cannot. I know not that they differ in one tittle more concerning the one God.

But concerning the one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus, *1 Tim. 2. 5.* The *Unitarians* willingly and heartily acknowledge, that he was fore-ordain'd before the foundation of the World, *1 Pet. 1. 20.* that he was born of the Virgin *Mary*, by the coming of the Holy Ghost upon her, and the power of the most High overshadowing her, *Luk. 1. 35.* and therefore he is called [*IS*] the Son of God ; likewise that he, and no Man but he, ascended into Heaven, and descended thence, *John 3. 13.* being sanctified and sent into the World, into which he came, not to do his own Will, but the Will of him that sent him, *John 6. 30.* that by reason of this mission and sanctification, he did, whilst he was here upon Earth, deservedly challenge the Name of God, or the Son of God, *John 10. 34, 35, 36.* in a far more excellent sense than either the Magistrates among the Jews, that were called gods, and Sons of the most High, *Psal. 82. 1, 6.* Or *Moses*, who was God to *Pharaoh*, *Exod. 7. 1.* and also to his

his Brother *Aaron*, Exod. 4. 16. Heb. or than any Angel, who in the Dispensation of the Law, did represent God, and was therefore called by his Name, *Act*s 7. 35. *Exod.* 23. 20. *Gal.* 3. 19. see *Jud.* 13. 22. And that as there was but one God then, so there is but one God now, notwithstanding that Jesus is *God* *ever all*. Unto which glorious and supream Dominion, next to the most high God himself, Jesus did attain, by doing the Will of God fully and perfectly on Earth, the perfection of which obedience was, that *being*, as is said, *in the form of God*, *he thought it not robbery* [or a prey] *to be equal with God*, *but made himself of no reputation*, &c. and became obedient unto Death, even the death of the Cross. Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name, *which is above every Name*, *that at the Name of Jesus every knee should bow*, — and that every tongue should confess that Jesus is Lord, *to the glory of God the Father*, *Phil.* 2. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. *That God hath made that same Jesus*, *whom ye [the Jews] have crucified*, *both Lord and Christ*, *Act*s 2. 36. *Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour*, *Act*s 5. 31. *God raised him from the dead*, *and set him at his own right hand*, *in the heavenly places*, *far above all principality and power*, &c. For by God's exalting Jesus, and setting him at his right hand, they understand that the same Man Jesus, that was crucified and raised from the dead, was also taken up in the sight of the Apostles into Heaven, a Cloud receiving him out of their sight, *Act*s 1. 9. And that he is there, having not now a Body of Flesh and Blood, (for *flesh and blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God*, *1 Cor.* 15. 50.) but an heavenly, spiritual, incorruptible and glorious body of a

Man, the like whereof all Saints shall have in the Resurrection, when this Man Jesuſ shall descend from Heaven to judge the World; that in the mean time he ſits at God's right hand, that is, he has all power in Heaven and Earth committed to him, and reigns over Men and Angels, as will appear by comparing 1 Cor. 15. 25. with Psal. 110. 1. They believe that the Father hath committed all judgment unto the Son; that all men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father, Joh. 5. 23. Therefore they worship Christ, and call upon him as their Lord, their King, their great High-Priest, their God, that ſearcheth their hearts, and is perfectly able to ſave them that come unto God by him. And they ſay, it's no wonder, that they honour Christ as God, whilſt they acknowledge God his Father to be above him, forasmuch as the Anthon to the Hebrews doth the ſame, (Heb. 1. 8, 9.) ſaying, *But unto the Son, he ſaith, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever, — Thou haſt loved Righteouſneſſ, and hated Iniquity: Therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the Oyl of Gladneſſ above thy Fellows.* Finally, *When all things ſhall be subdued under him [this Man Jeſus], then ſhall the Son alſo himſelf be ſubjeſt to him that put all things under him, that God may be all in all,* 1 Cor. 15. 28.

Now I know not any thing of all that I have ſaid concerning the Manhood, Resurrection, and Exaltation of Jeſus, wherein the *Trinitarians* and *Unitarians* do not agree. The only Point in diſference between them is this; Whether this Dominion, Power and Glory, which are confeſſed upon the Man Jeſus, be confeſſed upon him, by assuming him into a personal Union with God, ſo that the Man

and

and a Person of God make one individual Person ; or whether they be conferred upon him, by God's communicating to him such a Supernatural and Divine Power, as he never communicated, nor ever will, to any Man or Angel, and greater than which God himself cannot bestow. The first the *Trinitarians* hold, the latter the *Unitarians*. Herein they both agree, That the Man Jesus is really invested with this Power. But for the *Quakers*, I have shew'd, that they really deny this Person, this Man Jesus, and consequently all that power and glory which he is invested with. So that all that they talk of him, and all their contention for him is meer equivocation. The Man Jesus, the Mediator between God and Men, is, according to them, so far from being our King, our Lord and God, our High-Priest and Intercessor ; and from being in himself immortal, most happy, and glorious, that he has not so much Being as a Bat, I mean, a proper Bat, not one of Mr. Pen's Bats. So that he that shall call Jesus accursed, (O horrible !) (meaning by *Jesus*, that personal Beeing or Man that was dead, and is now alive in Heaven, a place remote from men on Earth) he commits really no greater offence, than he that shall call the *man i' th Moon* accursed ; for the one (as they hold) hath as much Beeing as the other. And now let the World judge, whether I did not use a soft expression, when I said that some Doctrines of the *Quakers*, did render them very dishonourable and dangerous to Christian Religion. If the *Deists* in *France* should once get the *Quakers* knack of equivocating, and meaning by Jesus Christ, when they speak of him, nothing but God, then what havock might they make of Christian Religion ?

I would not be mistaken, when I charge these things upon the *Quakers*, I mean the Leading Men; for I am still perswaded there are some honest-hearted among them, that neither know this that I have said, to be their Doctrine, nor believe it. And perhaps there may be some that own it and profess it, that are so silly, they neither know what they say, nor whereof they affirm.

Moreover, I profess solemnly, that it is not from any malice, envy, or revenge, that I impute these things to them; for I do heartily believe their Doctrine is such as I have said; and I hope the Proofs I have quoted out of their Writings, will sufficiently vindicate me in the eyes of all impartial Readers; and I can easily produce more of the same kind. See the *Dialogue between a Christian and a Quaker*.

Now as I have shew'd, that they *do not* believe the Beeing of Jesus the Mediator, and consequently none of those Articles of Christian Faith which depend upon his Beeing; so it were not very difficult to demonstrate, that they *cannot* upon their Principles believe any of them.

I will try a little, and for Example, let the Proposition to be believed be, *God raised up the Lord Jesus from the dead*: If you bring them Scripture, and universal Tradition, to get credit with them, it's all nothing: *G. Keith* saith, in his *Immediate Revelation*, p. 35. — *The best words uttered from Christ in the dayes of his flesh, or from any of the Apostles or Prophets, and yet recorded in the Scriptures, cannot reveal the Father, nor the Son either.* Again, p. 37. *Outward Revelation or Discovery by words spoken from without of Christ, or any of his Disciples, or Apostles, cannot reveal the Father nor the Son.* It seems then that

that if Christ himself (as after his Resurrection with his Apostles) should converse with us, and preach to us, that God had raised him from the dead, and if the whole Colledge of the Apostles should bear witness to what he said, all this could not work in us any true saving-Faith of the Proposition aforesaid, without an immediate Revelation within; for that's the purport of his Book, the Title whereof is, *Immediate Revelation — not ceased, but remaining — of indispensable necessity as to the whole Body in general, so to every Member thereof, every true Believer in particular.* And by immediate Revelation, he tells us, p. 16. *They understand not only immediate supernatural influences of the Spirit of God — to assist and enable or elevate the mind to know and understand savingly, but also such inward influences as are the very immediate Objects of our mind.* Hence he saith, p. 40. *The Lord knoweth the thoughts of Man to be but vanity, and his wisdom foolishness and enmity against God, even all that wisdom, which the carnal mind can gather into it self, whether from the Words of Scripture, or from the Works of Creation and Providence.* Here by *mans wisdom and carnal mind*, you must understand him of all Wisdom whatsoever, which comes not by immediate inward Revelation. So p. 59. *All your Scripture, literal, traditional Knowledge and Wisdom is a burthen unto this [something] in you.* And G. Whitehead saith, (*Christ Ascend.* p. 28.) *That [Faith] that is without the divine and immediate illumination of the Spirit within, which is no Divine Faith, but mens Knowledge, Faith, and Religion, are but Traditional, Literal, and Lifeless.* So that if W. P. would have dealt candidly and plainly with us, he should have told us that the infallible

Spirit

Spirit is the immediate Judge, Rule and Guide to men, and so that no man can have any true Faith or Religion without its immediate proposing, by way of Object, unto him, as was done to the Prophets and Apostles. Therefore *G. F.* in the very beginning of his *Mystery*, (as I hinted before) shewing *the ground of difference between the Priests and Professors, and all Sects in these Nations, and the Quakers*, saith, *That the controversie on their part is just and equal against them all, and that they have sufficient cause to cry against them, and to deny their Ministry, their Church, their Worship, and their whole Religion, as being not in the Power, and by the Spirit of the living God.* Compare this with what I have cited before, and then it plainly appears, that all right *Quakers* in *G. Fox*'s sense have renounced or denied their Faith, Worship and whole Christian Religion, which they had before they were *Quakers*, as being grounded (as ours is) upon Reason, Scriptures, the Preaching of Jesus, and his Apostles and Prophets, and Tradition, with an assistance of the Holy Spirit elevating the mind: but not upon immediate objective Revelation, such as the Apostles and Prophets had, and such as the *Quakers* now pretend to have. For we, and those that differ from them, profess those things before mentioned to be the ground of our Faith; they profess the last of Immediate Revelation to be the ground of their Faith and Religion; and deny ours to be Divine Faith or true Religion: Nay, they cry out against it as foolishnes and darkness, literal and lifeles.

So then *W. P.* doth but make a fair flourish, when he saith, p. 39. *The Scriptures we own, and the Divine Truth therein contained, we reverence and esteem*

as the Mind and Will of God to men : For they can not, according to their Principles, esteem any saying of Scripture, be it that God raised up the Lord Jesus from the dead, or any other word of any Apostle, or of Christ himself, I say they cannot esteem it as the Mind and Will of God, except they have an immediate Revelation dictating the same unto them : Which if they have, then the Scripture is superfluous to them, and they do no more esteem it the Mind and Will of God, because it is written in the Bible, than if it had been written in any other Book among Fables and Lies.

These things considered, I argue thus : If among the Professors of Religion in these Nations, there be those that sincerely confess the Lord Jesus, and heartily believe that God raised him from the dead, upon the grounds forementioned, and not upon the ground of immediate objective Revelation of God's Holy Spirit, then *G. Fox* and the *Quakers* deny, and cry out against true Christian Faith and Religion, and consequently cannot have them.

Again, If men in general cannot savingly believe without hearing a sent Preacher ; then men cannot believe by immediate inward Revelation : and then they that assert they can, and do, and deny the Antecedent, cannot have saving Faith. The Antecedent is true from *Rom. 10. 13, 14, 15.* The Consequent from the opposition between mediate and immediate, *1 Cor. 1. 18.*

They to whom the preaching of the Cross is foolishness, and not the Power of God, cannot have Gospel-Faith : But to *G. F.* and some *Quakers*, the preaching of the Cross, without immediate Revelation, is foolishness, and not the Power of God :

There-

Therefore G. F. &c. cannot have Gospel-Faith. Let us proceed now to the other Instances of Scripture abus'd, and show the tendency of it to false Doctrine.

(Inst. 29.) Next he would vindicate G. F. in correcting the Translators for rendring *νή*, *I protest by*, *2 Cor. 15. 31.* saying, there is nothing in the Greek for *I protest*; and yet Mr. P. cannot but grant that *νή* is commonly at least a particle of Swearing; and if but so, it follows that there is something in the Greek that answers *I protest by*; for supposing that not to be the sense of the place, which the current of Interpreters say is, yet there is that word *there* which will bear such a Translation, there is something in the Greek for *I protest*, which G. F. denies, and therein imposes upon his Reader, which is enough for my purpose.

Here W. P. (p. 91.) that he may be true to his presumptuous way of arguing, though he venture the abusing God and Men, tells us, That *an Oath having been made from the distrust of honesty in him that was to take it, where the cause (Lyes, Equivocations, &c.) is removed, the effect (Swearing) should cease*: As if Christ, or rather God himself, had distrusted his own honesty, when he sware unto Christ, *Thou art a Priest for ever after the Order of Melchise-dee*; or the Patriarch *Abraham*, the Father of the Faithful, had distrusted God's honesty, and therefore God sware to him to free him from his diffidence; and not because (as the Scripture speaks) *God [was] willing more abundantly to shew unto the Heirs of Promise, the immutability of his Counsel*, *Heb. 6. 17.*

(30.) Next we come to that Text in Matth. 23.

Neither

Neither be ye called *Masters*, &c. Here, as his manner is, he abuses my words, as if he came *out of Bedlam*, and then my Argument must be a Bedlam one. Read both, and compare, for I may not now repeat. If the *Quakers* restrain the Text, where they have reason; why may not others restrain it, where they have as good reason? and that without blaming the Text? or strange irreverence to *Holy Writ*? If my Neighbour be a Master of Servants, why may I not treat him in compellation as such? and not as if he had no Servant, and were himself a Servant? And by Mr. P's favour, I count it no sin to call another Man's Wife, *Good Wife*? or another Man's She-Servant, *Maid*? Mr. P. doth; but no sin to tell me, I have told a plain lye, when himself has made my words so, by detracting from them. And therefore the Reader has no reason to believe him, when he faith, *Civil honour, namely of calling Master, is repugnant to common Truth, and Christian Religion.*

But I wonder *W. P.* should take so much pains to vindicate *Stephen* in calling the Counsel of the Jews, *Men, Brethren, and Fathers*, who yet were not his proper Fathers; for he might with more ease have done it, by saying, He had a special impulse for it, as the *Quaker* that came many score of miles (as they said) to perform his obeysance to *Margaret Fell*, at her own House; where at a solemn Meeting, the Man rose up from his Seat, and went and fell down upon his knees (with his Hat in his hand) directly before *Margaret Fell*, and made his humble address to her by the compellation of *my dear Mother*! and beseech'd her to pray for him.

In like manner, on the third or fourth day after, *John Stubbs*, at another Meeting, requested the like favour

favour of her, with his Hat under his Arm standing, and calling her, *My dear everlasting Mother!* The truth of these things can be prov'd by eye and ear-witneses, and I suppose there are some *Quakers* that will attest them.

This is that *Margaret Fell*, who was formerly *Judge Fell's Wife*, and is now *G. Fox's*; concerning whom he gave forth a Paper, that his marriage with her, was a figure of the Marriage between Christ and the Church: Likewise that his Marriage was above the state of Adam in his Innocency, in the state of the second Adam who never fell. Thus I find it reported by a certain *Quaker* in a Letter (a notable piece) to his Friend. The same person saith, That upon two occasions persons kneel before *G. Fox*, though 'tis done in a very private manner, and but by a few; the one is, when he sends them forth to *Administer*; the other is, upon some misdemeanour committed by a *Minister*, who acknowledging his fault, upon his bended knees, *George absolves him*.

My next Argument was thus: Christ saith, Be ye not called *Katbegetas*, but he doth not forbid them to be called *Kyrioi*; and we find in Scripture *Philip* called by Strangers *Kyrie*, and *Paul* and *Silas*, *Kyrioi*; and Christ himself mistaken for a Gardener, by a notable Disciple called *Kyrie*, and all without rebuke; therefore the compellation of *Kyrie*, is not forbid in *Katbegetes*: If it be, our Lord Jesus himself, as well as the Apostles, will be brought under suspicion of conniving at sin, in a place where he had opportunity to correct it. And besides, the inspired Writers giving us no notice of any failure in any of these cases, the Scripture, and practice of Christ and the Apostles, and Primitive Believers, will

will be so far from being of Example and Teaching to us, that they will be a temptation to us unto evil; and, as Mr. P. sayes, *like the shadow of the true Rule*, that is, an evening shadow, which is five times as long as the substance it self. Let the Reader see now if he can pick any thing out of W. P.'s answer, but evasion and shuffle. He saith indeed, in excuse of our Lord's silence in the case, that *he never particularly check'd Peter for denying him*; which how parallel to this case, let the sober Reader judge; and how boldly our Lord's innocence is called into question, and how lamely defended. And whether G. F. would have incurred that suspicion of guilt in the like Circumstances? or the only Scripture of his Life and Doctrine, wrote by the *Quakers*, left him under it?

(31.) As for his defence of Women speaking in the Church, it's like the rest, meer shuffle. Judge what a pliant Conscience this man has! who can accuse some that he had nothing to do with, of making *John* speak equivocatingly, because they do not expound Scripture to his sense, and me a little before of *strange irreverence to Holy Writ* for restraining the Text, which himself also restrains; and here behold what a sense he puts upon *1 Cor. 14:34,35.* as if he were expounding one of the old Poetical Fables! But at length he comes to this; *I permit not an unlearned or ignorant Woman to speak in the Church;* And Did the Apostle permit, or Do the *Quakers* permit unlearned or ignorant men to speak in the Church? I said, *The Apostle forbids Women by Sex;* in those cases wherein he allows men by Sex to speak in the Church: Where's his Answer? Find it that can: He tells us of Women's labouring in the Lord,

Helpers in Christ Jesus? Servants of the Church: as if they might not do all that without speaking in the Church, where there were men enough qualified for that work. He tells us of Women prophesying, for among them (the *Quakers*) any profound & vehement prattle may serve for that: but I never yet heard of a *Quaker* that spake an unknown Tongue. And yet one would think they needed it enough, when they are sent to the *Indians*, or to the Great *Turk*.

(32, 33, 34, 35, 36.) These five Instances, (Jam. 3. 2. Ephes. 5. 25. Heb. 10. 27. Job 2. 10. 2 Pet. 1. 4.) the change of the Phrase in the two first and last, and the defect in the third and fourth, do all favour their doctrine of Perfection, which is indeed a Doctrine of Sin and Imperfection: for he is a perfect Man according to them, who sins not against his immediate Light or Conscience, and so their Perfection is consistent with all manner of sins of Ignorance or Error proceeding from any passion, as is most manifest in these two, *G. F.* and *W. P.*, who must be accounted perfect men, notwithstanding all their blasphemies against God and Christ, and contumelies against men, which I have evidently demonstrated. And then it's consistent with sins of Omission in great plenty, for whil'st they deny the Worship and whole Religion of all but themselves, they must of necessity want that love toward them, which is due to Christian Brethren. Behold here a sort of Christians, without either Faith in the true Christ, or love to his faithful Servants!

(37.) And it's not a little mischief that has been wrought by that Notion of *God's working all in us, and for us*, which *G. F.* will have the Apostle to say; and *W. P.* brings three Texts, from whence he infers

sers it, as if I had charged G. F. with a false InfERENCE, and not false Scripture.

(38.) Our Translation hath, (Isa. 8. 20.) --- If they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no Light in them: But G. F. You that speak not according to that Rule, it is because you hate the Light in you. And W. P. instead of vindicating him, rails at me. Who knows not what that change meant?

(39.) That G. F. may disparage the places wherein other Christians worship God, saith, Is God worshipped in Temples made with bands? And would have his Reader take that for Scripture. W. P. saith nothing to it.

(40.) I shew'd in my Epistle, p. 27. what Error of the Quakers is countenanced by G. F.'s putting is for was, 2 Cor. 5. 19. as if there were no work done by Christ for reconciling men, which he was not, and is not always a doing. I shew'd also that G. F. said, God was in Christ, reconciling himself to the World. But W. P. takes no notice of it. He seems to have wrote his Book only for the Quakers, or those that either never read my Epistle, or else have forgot it.

Upon the whole Matter, (for I have exceeded my intended brevity) let the impartial Reader judge of W. P.'s, and my performance in this Argument: And whether I have not prov'd by evidence of sense what I undertook, viz. That G. F. is a false Prophet, a Liar, or Impostor? Yea, whether W. P. himself hath not confirm'd unawares this Sentence concerning him? Whether it is not horrid impiety for these men to pretend the guidance of God's infallible Spirit in what they write; and to run into such

uch Absurdities, Falsities, and pernicious Errors, as I have proy'd them guilty of? Whether it will not be great folly in me, or any man henceforward to write, or indeed to speak to these men concerning Matters of Religion, (except perhaps further to discover their deceit) whilst they practise such un-heard-of Equivocation in their words, as renders all Discourse vain and ineffectual? Or, is it possible to convince those men by Reason, that will deny the evidence of Sense? Besides, how can there be either end or fruit of writing, where a man shall not only misunderstand things that are plain; but impute to his Adversary Words and Sayings of his own coyning, and proceed to the bitterest reproaches thereupon; and in the mean time omit to take notice of Matters of moment? Therefore I have entitled this Discourse, CONTROVERSIE ENDED, for I am bold to affirm, that it must either be ended here, or if not, It may be continued infinitely upon the same grounds. What remains then to be done, but earnestly to beg of God through Jesus Christ, that he would give them repentance to the acknowledgement of the Truth.

O Holy Jesuſ, who waſt dead, but art alive, and liveſt for evermore; who waſt crucified through weakness, but liveſt through the Power of God; to whom God, even thy Father, hath given all Power in Heaven and Earth; who canſt be touched with the feeling of our Infirmitiess, for thou waſt in all things tempted as we are; Have pity upon these men, who (ſome of them) have a zeal of God but not according to knowledge, work in them Humility, and

and enlighten the eyes of their minds, that they may acknowledge thee to be their Lord, and the Mediator between God and Men; that they may no longer despise that Knowledge and Faith of thee, which is by Preaching or Tradition through the Holy Scriptures; but may contend earnestly for the Faith, which was once *delivered to the Traditio.* Saints. Have mercy upon me, O Lord, pardon mine InfirmitieS, and judge whether I have not been as careful not to wrong them in this Work, as I would have them, or any man to be of not injuring me? and grant that it may be of benefit and advantage to many, and that thou mayest be glorified thereby. Amen.

POSTSCRIPT.

Now it will appear whether there be any prudent and honest men among the Governing *Quakers*, by their dealing with *W. P.* for this Book of his: for I appeal to the Reader, whether he thinks there be any such inconsiderable Society of Christians in *England*, that would not either have requir'd a publick acknowledgment of his Offence, or have disown'd that Member, which should have wrote in their Defence a Book of 138 pages, and but two of them (that is *p. 130, and 131.*) that have any pertinency of Answer to their Antagonist's chief Argument; and that also, which is there alledg'd, to be

be partly false, and altogether inconſequēt, ſave againſt himſelf: But to contain many pages that di-ſtinctly confirm and aggravate the Charge brought againſt them, and moreover, to be ſo ſuft with palpable, calumnious, and ſelf-praying untruths, and vi-olent Language, that it makes their Caufe and Dealing odious in the ſight of ſober men: all which I have prov'd *W. P.* to have done in relation to the *Quakers.*

It will eaſily appear to the conſidering Reader, that I have, for brevity ſake, omitted to improve many Advantages which my rafh Adverſary has given me, contenting my ſelf to intimate them, and ſo pro-ceed. And he that has diligently and judiciously read my Epiftle and his Anſwer, may perceive that I have not ſo much as intimated diuers things of much advantage to my Caufe and Person. Among thofe is that Paſſage in p. 136. where he eſſayes to anſwer ſome of my Reasons for keeping my Name from them, and ſayes, very civilly, That I horribly belie them: Why? wherein? Not in this, That there are ſome of their Writers, that make it a great part of their Anſwers to Books, the reproaching the Author. Let this very Book of *W. P.* be an Instance, How many Sheets muſt it have wanted, if all of that kind had been ſubſtracted? Not in this, That they are very Rhetorical in that point. I am perſwad-ed *W. P.* could not Rhetoricate ſo well in the praife of any Person in the World, (G. Fox not excepted) as he hath in reproach of me. He has taken up one of Muggleton's peculiar Phrases, wherewith to a-buſe me and my Friends, calling us Serpentine Aſſo-ciates. It's like Muggleton had us'd it in *W. P.*'s hearing, and *W. P.* according to his nature, was taken

taken with it, and so bestowed it upon his next Adversary. Neither in this do I belie them, that if they had my Name, then it must be considered what Party I am of, and accordingly all that is odious, or so reputed, either in the Doctrine or Practice of the whole Party must be raked up against me. Let his Book be witness whether he has not dealt so with me, even upon a suspicion of my name. But (faith he) we never charg'd the infirmities of a single Person, ~~so~~ rather than upon that guilty Person, unless he were convicted at, or justified in his wickedness by any ~~bold~~ Party.

Now here lies the Wit, If any part of the Charge be not found apparent, all the rest, how manifest soever, must go for a horrible lie! But *W. P.* (kind Man!) will not put me to much trouble in searching for an Instance: It is but turning back to p. 7. and there I find a single Person described, (as it were in a *Fine and Cry*) and his being *wanting in the very Alphabets of common civility*, attributed plurally to him and me at least, and I think to all the Party that *W. P.* assigns for us. Has he not then tak'd up 'a- gainst me what is odious, or so reputed both in the Doctrine and Practice of a Party, and of a parti- lar Person? Which he can never prove me guilty of justifying in that case.

Another Instance shall be of an elder date ; see the Epistle to G. Whitehead's Divinity, &c. where G. F. tells the *Presbyterians* and *Independents*, that when the People of God, called **Quakers**, were gathered together in divers places to Worship God, then you said, They were plotting together against Oliver, (whom some of you called the *Light of your Eyes, and Breath of your Nostrils*) to bring in King Charles. If they

can make it appear (which I much doubt) that one
"or another *Presbyterian* or *Independent* did suggest
any such thing against them, it can never be believed
by any sober Man that that Person was connived at,
or justified therein by one or both Parties, *Presby-
terians* or *Independents*, and yet here G. F. and J. S.
impute it to them both indefinitely; and that so, as
thereby to insinuate that the *Quakers* were generally
at least esteemed Friends to the King, and sufferers
upon that account: But the *Presbyterians* and *Inde-
pendents* Friends to *Oliver*, and Enemies to the King
and the *Quakers*. O the Candour and Simplicity of
G. Fox! O the Modesty and Meekness of W. Pen!

Again, In reference to their calling men *Tinker* or
Taylor, W. P. replies, *We never told the World* mens
Trades in a way of detraction or reproach, our Soul's
abor it. When he has taken shame to himself in the
ingenuous acknowledgement to the *World*, of those un-
truths I have prov'd him guilty of; then he may
better be believed. In the mean time who can be-
lieve that G. W. did not call *Bunyan* the *Tinker*, by
way of detraction, when he adds immediately, a
caviling *envious* man; and in a late Pamphlet, calls
caviling Language, *Tinkers-Khetorick*. Besides, *Tink-
er* is a term of reproach, and he that is such, may
by Statute be punished as a Rogue.

F. N. I. S.

The Book intituled *The Spirit of the Quakers* &c. &c. is
to be had at the Elephant and Castle from the Royal Ex-
change in Cornhill, London.

